

programs are not supported by the majority of the people of the United States.

Why, then, is it important to change the leadership in Congress and put Republicans in charge of the committees? Because while Democratic chairmen in both the House and Senate may vote against the President, they must and do, report his legislation out of committee. Therefore, we never get the opportunity to vote for proper legislation. Republican chairmen of committees, on the contrary, would report out the correct, constructive legislation to meet the challenge of this day, at home and abroad, so all Mem-

bers of Congress could vote in favor of proposals which would move the country ahead instead of being forced, as we now are, to vote consistently against administration-sponsored measures almost solely designed to move this country into the "democratic socialism" advocated by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., one of the White House advisers. (Yes, being negative or positive depends on what you're for and against.)

As Representative of the Fifth District of Texas I will not sit idly by while the two faces of danger—misrepresentation and misunderstanding—force us closer and closer to

the ADA-socialistic programs and the end of our free competitive system. It will continue to be my constant endeavor to fight for what I believe is the goal of the people of the Fifth District of Texas, the strengthening and expansion of the free enterprise system with all its guarantees of liberty for the individual, its promise of reward for those who are willing to work and risk for the opportunity to get ahead, the system which is, in truth, our American heritage and which has given a richer, fuller, more abundant life to more people than any other system ever devised by man.

SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 21, 1962

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, without Thee, Thy life, Thy light, Thy love, our own hearts are deceitful above all things and desperately wicked. In our generation our shuddering souls have peered into pits of human horror which but reveal the awful depths to which man may fall when he turns utterly from Thee.

Unless we find Thee, and art found of Thee, the laws of Thy physical universe break our mortal life and the laws of Thy moral order make mockery of our futile rebellion.

Breathe now Thy peace on hearts that pray—the peace that comes only when our jarring discords are tuned to the music of Thy will; then, as heralds of Thy love, send us forth across all barriers of race and creed, bearing to yearning hearts, as a holy sacrament, the bread of human kindness and the red wine of willing sacrifice.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 20, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of the Committee on Government Operations, be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBJECTION TO MEETING OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Foreign Relations Committee have consent of the Senate to sit at this moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will check on that; the information is not available at the desk at the moment.

Mr. MORSE. While the Chair is checking on it, I should like to take 3 minutes, in the morning hour, to discuss it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair respond to the Senator's inquiry: The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that there is no information to the effect that the Foreign Relations Committee does have permission to sit today while the Senate is in session.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that I object to the Foreign Relations Committee's sitting while the Senate is in session.

Mr. President, speaking on the objection—

The VICE PRESIDENT. To what is the Senator from Oregon objecting now?

Mr. MORSE. I want the RECORD to show that I object to the Foreign Relations Committee's sitting at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has any such request been made?

Mr. MORSE. I have just come from the Foreign Relations Committee hearing; and I want the RECORD to show that if the committee is sitting, I object.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry, if the Senator from Oregon will yield for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, it is understood that until 11 o'clock the committee had its regular right to sit.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, yes; and I sat with the committee until 10:46. Then I came to the floor to object to any meeting of the committee after the Senate convened.

Mr. President, there is pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a series of bills, requested by the State Department, which would result in the expenditure of a considerable amount of U.S. dollars abroad, in connection with the construction of chanceries and embassies and the purchase of real estate. Before the committee this morning I took the position that in my judgment all those matters should go over until January, until a reappraisal can be made of the entire matter of the expenditure of American funds abroad.

When I think of the slum-clearance problem confronting the country, when I think of the hovels in which a great many Americans in the low-income brackets have to live, and when I think of the other domestic needs of our own people at this very serious time in our economic situation, I do not propose, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, to participate in a "rush" act in the closing days of the session—to rush through the Foreign Relations Committee, preparatory to rushing through the Senate, these bills which involve the authorization of the expenditure of millions of our dollars abroad.

I believe the brake must be put on; and I shall do everything I can to put on the brake, so as to prevent the authorization of such expenditures of millions of our dollars abroad in the dying days of this session of Congress.

Furthermore, we had better take a long look at our economy, because I have said many times that our economy is the greatest defense weapon we have.

When I sit in the Foreign Relations Committee, as I did this morning, and am told by representatives of the State Department that France is building an embassy here, that Great Britain is building an embassy there, and that some other country is building an embassy somewhere else—as if that were sufficient justification for the expenditure of millions of our dollars on the proposed building program—I say that I reject that argument. The argument that we have to "keep up with the Joneses" does not appeal to me, when I know the economic situation which exists in our own country.

When people in the low-income brackets cannot have a tax relief program now, but have to rely on the President's promise that perhaps at the next session of Congress there may be a tax-reduction program, but we do not know what it will consist of, I am one Senator who will not vote for another expenditure of our funds abroad at this time. Unless it can be demonstrated

that such an expenditure is an emergency matter now, I shall oppose action on these bills until next January when full consideration can be given to them.

When I consider the number of American businessmen who are working, in effect, for the Government, at a 52 percent corporate tax base, when it should be reduced now, not next year, I do not propose to sit in the Foreign Relations Committee and vote in favor of bills which would authorize the expenditure of millions of our dollars abroad, until we take a long look now at our own economy. As I said at the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee, I am in favor of returning home now, and not approving in the committee at this session of Congress and not having the Senate take up now bills which can well wait until January.

So I wish to make perfectly clear that in the committee I shall object to the approval of bills which call for the authorization of the expenditure of such funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The time available to the Senator from Oregon, under the 3-minute limitation, has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I merely take a second to hail the conversion of my distinguished friend, the Senator from Oregon, to the conservative course.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am afraid the Senator from Illinois does not know who the convert is. I am glad to have him on my side of the aisle for once. I have stood for tax reform since 1947.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon is the convert.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me assure both the minority leader and the Senator from Oregon that any bill which comes from the Foreign Relations Committee will first have to be cleared by the policy committee for action on the floor of the Senate; and I do not believe that clearance is going to be quite as quick as some might expect.

I think the Senator from Oregon has made a very valid point, this morning, in reference to expenditures for new facilities in various parts of the world; and I wish to assure the Senator that as one member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I am very sympathetic with his remarks.

REPORT ENTITLED "JUVENILE DELINQUENCY"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1903)

Mr. DODD, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 408, 87th Congress, 1st session, as extended, submitted a report entitled "Juvenile Delinquency," which was ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably 484 nominations for permanent appointment and promotion in

the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Coast Guard in the grade of captain and below. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations are as follows:

Fair J. Bryant, and sundry other persons for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

Harold D. Seielstad, and sundry other persons for appointment in the U.S. Coast Guard.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

S. 3658. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Antidumping Act, 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 3659. A bill to amend section 5 of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended, to provide a definition of the term "age" as used in the labeling and advertising of whisky; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 3660. A bill to extend the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to temporary summer employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 3661. A bill for the relief of St. Joseph's Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXXIV, RELATIVE TO THE REPORTING OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE SENATE BY RADIO OR TELEVISION

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. MORSE) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 378) to amend rule XXXIV relative to the reporting of proceedings of the Senate by radio or television, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE ANTIDUMPING ACT

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend certain provisions of the Antidumping Act of 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in its enforcement, and for other purposes.

I hope that this legislation will be considered, together with other bills to amend the Antidumping Act now before the Senate Finance Committee, either as separate legislation or as possible amendments to H.R. 11970, the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have included in the body of the RECORD at this point the full text of the bill and a summary of the purposes of this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3658) to amend certain provisions of the Antidumping Act, 1921, to provide for greater certainty, speed, and efficiency in the enforcement thereof, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 201 (a) of the Antidumping Act, 1921 (19 U.S.C. 160 (a)), is amended—

(1) by deleting the words "he shall so advise" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "he shall promptly so advise";

(2) by deleting the words "whether an industry in the United States is being or is likely to be injured, or is prevented from being established, by reason of the importation" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "whether an industry in the United States, or any portion thereof producing like or competitive products, is being or is likely to be injured or is threatened by injury, or is prevented from being established, by reason, in whole or in part, of the importation";

(3) by inserting between the first and second sentences the following new sentence: "The Secretary shall make his determination under the preceding sentence (or shall make a determination that the merchandise involved is not being and is not likely to be sold in the United States or elsewhere at less than its fair value), from the information then available to him, within three months from the date on which the question of dumping is first raised by or presented to him or any person to whom authority under this section has been delegated."; and

(4) by deleting the words "the Secretary shall make public a notice" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "the Secretary shall immediately make public a notice".

(b) Section 201(b) of such Act is amended by deleting the words "and shall authorize" and inserting in lieu thereof "and shall immediately direct".

(c) Section 202(a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Levy, collection, and payment of such special dumping duty shall be ordered no later than thirty days from the date on which the finding as provided for in section 201 is made public."

(d) Section 202(b)(1) of such Act is amended by deleting the words "the fact that" and inserting in lieu thereof "differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery resulting from the fact that".

(e) Section 202(c)(1) of such Act is amended by deleting the words "the fact that" and inserting in lieu thereof "differences in the cost of manufacture, sale or delivery resulting from the fact that".

SEC. 2. The Antidumping Act, 1921, is further amended by renumbering sections 208 through 213 as sections 211 through 216, respectively, and by inserting after section 207 the following new sections:

"SEC. 208. (a) In the case of any imported merchandise, irrespective of whether such merchandise is the subject of any proceeding, determination or finding under section 201 hereof, any person desiring to export

such merchandise to, or import such merchandise into, the United States shall be required to present evidence satisfactory to the collector at the port or ports of entry, that the exporter's sales price or the purchase price of such merchandise is not less than its fair market value (or, in the absence of such value, than its constructed value). Unless the evidence so presented is sufficient to afford the collector reasonable grounds to believe that the merchandise will not be sold in the United States or elsewhere at less than its fair value, he shall withhold appraisement and delivery as to all such merchandise, and the Secretary shall thereupon immediately proceed to make the determination provided in section 201(a) hereof.

"(b) In the case of any imported merchandise as to which the collector shall deem sufficient the evidence required under subsection (a) of this section, irrespective of whether such merchandise is the subject of any proceeding, determination or finding under section 201 hereof, unless the person exporting such merchandise to, or importing such merchandise into, the United States shall have declared under oath before the collector at the time of entry, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary, that to the best of his knowledge and belief the exporter's sales price, or the purchase price, of such merchandise is not less than its foreign market value (or, in the absence of such value, than its constructed value), it shall be unlawful for the collector to permit entry of the merchandise into the United States.

"(c) Whenever, in the case of any imported merchandise as to which the Secretary has reason to believe or suspect, as provided in section 201(b), that the purchase price is less, or that the exporter's sales price is less or likely to be less, than the foreign market value (or, in the absence of such value, than the constructed value) of the merchandise, the person exporting such merchandise to, or importing such merchandise into, the United States shall be required by the Secretary, under regulations to be prescribed by him, to submit appropriate evidence of its foreign market value (or, in the absence of such value, its constructed value). Such evidence shall be in addition to the evidence required to be submitted under subsection (a) of this section. If for any reason the Secretary is not satisfied that such person has exercised reasonable diligence in seeking to comply with the requirements of this subsection, he may consider this fact in arriving at his determination under section 201(a) hereof.

"Sec. 209. If the Secretary shall find, as provided in section 201 hereof, that any class or kind of imported merchandise is being or is likely to be sold in the United States or elsewhere at less than its fair value, the person exporting such merchandise to, or importing such merchandise into, the United States pursuant to the declaration required by section 208 hereof, shall be liable to a penalty, which shall not be less than 20 percent of, and shall not exceed, the fair value of the merchandise as found by the Secretary under section 201. Such penalty shall be independent of, and in addition to, any special dumping duty which may be imposed under section 202. Payment of such penalty shall be a condition precedent to any further exportation of merchandise to, or importation of merchandise into, the United States by the person subject to the penalty.

"Sec. 210. The special dumping duty required by section 202 hereof shall be applicable in all cases in which the Secretary shall have made a finding as provided in section 201, irrespective of whether the merchandise which is the subject of such finding has been imported or is sought to be imported without payment of duty subject to the provision of title 10, United States Code, section 2383."

Sec. 3. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to all merchandise as to which no appraisal report has been made on or before the date of the enactment of this Act: *Provided*, That with respect to such merchandise as to which, on or before such date, the question of dumping shall have been raised by or presented to the Secretary of the Treasury or any person to whom authority under section 201 of the Antidumping Act, 1921, has been delegated, the Secretary shall determine within three months from the date of the enactment of this Act whether the merchandise is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States or elsewhere at less than its fair value.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the amendments made by this Act shall not apply to any merchandise as to which no appraisal report has been made on or before the date of the enactment of this Act, if such merchandise—

(1) was exported from the country of exportation before the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) is subject to a finding under the Antidumping Act, 1921, which (A) is outstanding on the date of the enactment of this Act, or (B) was revoked on or before the date of the enactment of this Act but is still applicable to such merchandise.

The summary presented by Mr. CASE, is as follows:

SUMMARY OF PURPOSES OF BILL

1. The bill seeks to expedite enforcement of the act by establishing time limits within which the various procedures provided therein must be completed. Thus, language has been added requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to determine, within 90 days from the date when the question is first raised, whether foreign merchandise is being or is likely to be sold in the United States or elsewhere at less than fair value (sec. 1(a)(3)). Similarly, if the Secretary finds that the merchandise is being sold at less than fair value, he is required to act promptly in referring the matter to the Tariff Commission for a determination of possible injury to domestic industries (sec. 1(a)(1)) and, if the Tariff Commission determines in the affirmative, in making public his finding that dumping has occurred (sec. 1(a)(4)). The bill would also amend the present statutory language to make clear that, if the Secretary has reason to believe that sales of imported merchandise may be occurring at less than fair value, appraisement is required to be withheld (sec. 1(b)). In every case in which the Secretary finds that dumping has occurred, the special dumping duty shall be imposed within 30 days following the date of such finding (sec. 1(c)).

2. The bill seeks to modify the criteria by which the Tariff Commission is to determine whether sales of imported merchandise at less than fair value cause or threaten injury to a domestic industry, in order to assist in insuring that relief will be available in all instances in which dumping practices have an injurious domestic impact (sec. 1(a)(2)).

3. In recognition of the fact that the foreign exporter, or the U.S. importer, is frequently the only party having access to information respecting prices (or, where necessary, costs) in the country of origin of the merchandise or in third countries, the bill would require any such person to provide, as a condition precedent to the entry of the merchandise into the United States, at least prima facie evidence that the exporter's sales price, or the purchase price, of the merchandise is not less than its fair market value, or constructed value (proposed sec. 208(a), contained in sec. 2(a) of the attached bill). The information required by this provision is intended to be more de-

tailed than that provided for in the present special customs invoice form.

4. The bill would require that the foreign exporter, or U.S. importer, certify with each shipment, as a condition precedent to the entry of the merchandise into the United States, that the merchandise will not be sold at less than fair value (proposed sec. 208(b), contained in sec. 2(a) of the attached bill).

5. For the reasons stated in point (3) above, the bill would require that, in any case in which the Secretary of the Treasury has reason to believe that sales of imported merchandise may be occurring at less than fair value, the foreign exporter, or U.S. importer, of such merchandise shall be required to submit further evidence of its foreign market value or constructed value. This evidence is to be in addition to that required to establish a prima facie case as provided in the proposed section 208(a). Failure or refusal to submit such evidence may be weighed by the Secretary in determining whether the merchandise is being or is likely to be sold at less than fair value (proposed sec. 208(c), contained in sec. 2(a) of the attached bill).

6. In order to give effect to the certification required by the proposed section 208(b), the bill would impose a penalty upon the foreign exporter, or U.S. importer, if the Secretary of the Treasury should subsequently determine that the merchandise with respect to which the certification was given is being or is likely to be sold at less than its fair value. The penalty, which may range from 20 to 100 percent of the fair value of the merchandise as found by the Secretary, is to be in addition to any special dumping duty that may be imposed under section 202 of the act. No further merchandise is to be exported to, or imported into, the United States by the party subject to the penalty until it is paid in full (proposed sec. 209, contained in sec. 2(b) of the attached bill).

7. The bill would amend the act to demonstrate a clear legislative intent that it be equally applicable irrespective of whether the foreign merchandise is exported to, or imported into, the United States subject to the duty-free provision of title 10, United States Code, section 2383 (proposed sec. 210, contained in sec. 2(c) of the attached bill).

EXPERIMENTAL COVERAGE BY RADIO AND TELEVISION OF SELECTED SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am today submitting a resolution, which I send to the desk for appropriate reference, and which I hope will interest my colleagues. The resolution would give to the Committee on Rules and Administration authority to determine the times and conditions under which television and radio broadcasters would be permitted to cover the Senate proceedings.

Mr. President, I first started this in the House of Representatives in 1951. It seems to me that developments since that time have very clearly indicated that we are very much behind the times as to allowing direct reporting by television and radio of certain key proceedings in the Senate of the United States. For example, Mr. President, I ask Senators to think of what the whole Nation would have done in terms of interest and of becoming more interested in how we operate if the people could have heard something of the debate and the key rollcall vote on cloture in respect to the communications satellite bill.

Mr. President, the same is true of the bill for medical care of the aged, on the motion to table and the so-called "tense rollcall vote," as to which the people had to take the word of the newspapers, which are great. Everybody knows that more newspapers will be read if people are more interested, and the way to get them interested is to show what goes on in the Senate.

Mr. President, we are now televising committee hearings, so that any basic objection to the idea of putting Senate proceedings on television should be answered by that precedent.

Mr. President, we all know that the United Nations debates have been for a long time televised, and with great advantage to the United Nations and great advantage to understanding by the people of the United States.

Mr. President, we just broke a precedent of 35 years by voting cloture at long last in the Senate. It seems to me that rather than to extend debate, television and radio broadcasts of key proceedings very likely would contract debate, because people can get quite bored and begin to question whether we know what we are doing if we do not stick to the point.

Mr. President, the success of television coverage of United Nations debates, the established and generally successful practice of televising selected congressional committee investigating sessions, and the recent breakthroughs in televising of legislative proceedings in certain of the States suggest that direct radio and television coverage of selected Senate sessions may well be in the public interest. It should at least be tried on an experimental basis.

I personally favor the broadest possible coverage of vital Senate proceedings. I believe it would have a beneficial effect on the legislative process. Bringing Congress closer to the people can only result in a more informed citizenry and a more responsive legislature. Prime examples are some of the debates and the tense votes on the communications satellite bill and on medical care for the aging in the Senate. The whole Nation should have had the opportunity to see and hear these debates and rollcalls. And also, there would be no need to seek to dramatize an issue to the Nation by extended debates. Television would dramatize the issue in a matter of days.

My resolution would amend rule XXXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, which permits the Senate Rules and Administration Committee to make rules and regulations regarding use of the Senate wing of the Capitol, by inserting this new sentence:

Such regulations shall make appropriate provisions for reporting of proceedings of the Senate by radio or television at such times and under such conditions as may be specified in such regulations or by resolution of the Committee on Rules and Administration from time to time.

In 1960 and 1961 legislative proceedings were opened successfully to television cameras in Arizona, Idaho, Kansas, Oklahoma, Michigan and Massachusetts. In many other States, legislative committee hearings and even some judicial

proceedings were also televised successfully in recent months.

For all those reasons, Mr. President, I think the Senate ought to catch up with the times and, in selected cases, when it is appropriate in the judgment of the Committee on Rules and Administration, permit the proceedings to be covered not only by the distinguished and most able services of the members of the press gallery but also by the radio broadcasts and television cameras themselves, so that we may come "live" to the people of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 378) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That (a) the second paragraph of rule XXXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by inserting therein, immediately after the first sentence thereof, the following new sentence: "Such regulations shall make appropriate provision for the reporting of proceedings of the Senate by radio or television at such times and under such conditions as may be specified in such regulations or by resolution of the Committee from time to time."

(b) The second sentence of the second paragraph of rule XXXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by inserting therein, immediately after the words "radio, wire, wireless", the term "television."

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Madam President, I am very much honored that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] should join with me in the sponsorship of the resolution relating to television, which I submitted this morning.

DRUG INDUSTRY ANTITRUST ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HART, and Mr. DODD) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1552) to amend and supplement the antitrust laws with respect to the manufacture and distribution of drugs, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. HART, Mr. DODD, and Mr. CLARK) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 1552, *supra*, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REVENUE ACT OF 1962—AMENDMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to kill the investment credit section of the tax bill, H.R. 10650. The investment credit is the one significant tax cut proposed in the pending tax bill. It represents a revenue loss of more than a billion dollars when the budget is already sure to be seriously unbalanced next year.

Although the proposal would represent a billion-dollar windfall for business, many business leaders actually testified against it, as an unwanted subsidy.

Indeed a comprehensive McGraw-Hill survey of business earlier this year and

a later study by the Wall Street Journal showed that this new loophole would stimulate almost no additional investment.

The recent Joint Economic Committee hearings have developed abundant evidence that the additional funds this proposal is designed to provide for business investment will not stimulate that investment.

Every witness, including Treasury Secretary Dillon, the chief proponent of the investment credit, admitted that there is no lack of funds to finance expansion of plant and equipment by business firms. Cash flows to businesses are at an all-time high relative to spending on plant and equipment—the very kind the investment credit is supposed to help finance.

As I pointed out when I appeared in opposition to this feature before the Senate Finance Committee, the investment credit will not work, it is unfair to other taxpayers, it aggravates the business cycle, and it would result in a huge revenue loss to the Treasury.

I hope that the Senate will reject it and thus clear the deck for the overall tax reform which I hope will be enacted next year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF AMENDMENTS TO CERTAIN BILLS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the engrossment of the amendments to the bills H.R. 10431, H.R. 10432, H.R. 10433, and H.R. 10931, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make such corrections in regard to typographical, clerical, and printing errors as may appear in these bills.

H.R. 10431, to revise, codify, and enact title 37 of the United States Code, entitled "Pay and Allowances of the Uniformed Services."

H.R. 10432, to amend title 39, United States Code, to codify certain recent public laws relating to the postal service and to improve the code.

H.R. 10433, to amend title 10, United States Code, to codify recent military laws, and to improve the code.

H.R. 10931, to revise and codify the general and permanent laws relating to and in force in the Canal Zone, and to enact the Canal Zone code.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 273. An act for the relief of Hrach Samuel Arukian;

S. 981. An act to extend certain authority of the Secretary of the Interior exercised

through the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior, to areas outside the national domain;

S. 1208. An act to amend Public Law 86-506, 86th Congress (74 Stat. 199), approved June 11, 1960;

S. 2399. An act to provide for the establishment of the Frederick Douglass home as a part of the park system in the National Capital, and for other purposes;

S. 2916. An act to change the names of the Edison Home National Historic Site and the Edison Laboratory National Monument, to authorize the acceptance of donations, and for other purposes; and

S. 3112. An act to add certain lands to the Pike National Forest in Colorado and the Carson National Forest and the Santa Fe National Forest in New Mexico, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 538. An act to amend section 205 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to empower certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration to administer oaths to witnesses;

S. 901. An act to advance the marine sciences, to establish a comprehensive 10-year program of oceanographic research and surveys, to promote commerce and navigation, to secure the national defense, to expand ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources, to authorize the construction of research and survey ships and laboratory facilities, to expedite oceanographic instrumentation, to assure systematic studies of effects of radioactive materials in marine environments, to enhance the public health and general welfare, and for other purposes;

S. 2876. An act to extend the authority to insure mortgages under sections 809 and 810 of the National Housing Act, and to extend the coverage of section 810 to include persons employed at or in connection with an installation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or the Atomic Energy Commission; and

S. 2973. An act to revise the boundaries of Capulin Mountain National Monument, N. Mex., to authorize acquisition of lands therein, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 86) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 297. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to prohibit the award of contracts by the United States to certain persons;

H.R. 1681. An act for the relief of Gabriel Chehebar, his wife, Marcelle Levy Chehebar, and their minor children, Albert, Zakia, Zaki, Jacques, and Joseph Chehebar;

H.R. 1696. An act for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.;

H.R. 2796. An act to provide for the renewal of certain municipal, domestic, and industrial water supply contracts entered into under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3529. An act to amend the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 857; 25 U.S.C. 406, 407), with respect to the sale of Indian timber;

H.R. 4800. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Curtis;

H.R. 5604. An act to amend the acts of May 21, 1926, and January 25, 1927, relating to the construction of certain bridges across the Delaware River, so as to authorize the use of certain funds acquired by the owners of such bridges for purposes not directly related to the maintenance and operation of such bridges and their approaches;

H.R. 6190. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the repair or replacement for veterans of certain prosthetic or other appliances damaged or destroyed as a result of certain accidents;

H.R. 7781. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey by quitclaim deed a parcel of land in Prince Georges County, Md., to the Silver Hill Voluntary Fire Department and Rescue Squad;

H.R. 9128. An act for the relief of Sgt. Ernest I. Aguilar;

H.R. 9459. An act to amend section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of Defense to settle certain claims in the amount of \$10,000 or less;

H.R. 9473. An act for the relief of Kenneth F. Miller;

H.R. 9587. An act for the relief of Anthony E. O'Sorlo;

H.R. 9590. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Edward Hirsch;

H.R. 9737. An act to amend section 641 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that deductions shall not be made from Federal payments to a State home because of amounts collected from the estates of deceased veterans and used for recreational or other purposes not required by State laws;

H.R. 9747. An act to amend section 514(1) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended;

H.R. 9775. An act for the relief of Nihat Ali Uzun;

H.R. 9832. An act for the relief of Jack Shandler;

H.R. 9914. An act for the relief of San-Man Inn of Manning, Inc.;

H.R. 9957. An act to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (72 Stat. 1274; 5 U.S.C. 73b-3), relating to travel expenses of civilian officers and employees assigned to duty posts outside the continental United States;

H.R. 10111. An act for the relief of Marvin M. Greenlee;

H.R. 10134. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain land in Prince Georges County, Md., to the American National Red Cross;

H.R. 10160. An act for the relief of Mrs. A. R. Lendlan;

H.R. 10415. An act for the relief of Earl T. Briley;

H.R. 11164. An act to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the Quincy Columbia Basin Irrigation District, authorize similar contracts with any of the Columbia Basin Irrigation Districts, and to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act of 1943 (57 Stat. 14), as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11266. An act to amend the act of March 8, 1922, as amended, to extend its provisions to the townsite laws applicable in the State of Alaska;

H.R. 11388. An act for the relief of Maurice Casner and Elleen G. Casner;

H.R. 11866. An act for the relief of Kim Chung Shin (Mary Rathbun);

H.R. 11543. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands adjacent to the Sultland Parkway in Prince Georges County, Md., to Sultland Lodge No. 1856, Loyal Order of Moose;

H.R. 11551. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Maryland to the Holy Cross Lutheran Church, Greenbelt, Md., and for other purposes;

H.R. 11594. An act to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments;

H.R. 11728. An act to amend section 1208 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize investment of the war risk insurance fund in securities of, or guaranteed by, the United States;

H.R. 11887. An act to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex.;

H.R. 11899. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for a Federal telecommunications fund;

H.R. 12024. An act for the relief of Li-brande P. Caltaglione;

H.R. 12090. An act for the relief of James Comeau;

H.R. 12164. An act to provide for the establishment of the Fort St. Marks National Historic Site;

H.R. 12416. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of chestnut extract proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act;

H.R. 12459. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Coast Guard;

H.R. 12589. An act to amend the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, as amended; and

H.R. 12701. An act for the relief of Catalina Properties, Inc.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 509) providing the express approval of the Congress, pursuant to section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)), for the disposition of certain materials from the national stockpile, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H.R. 297. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to prohibit the award of contracts by the United States to certain persons;

H.R. 6190. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the repair or replacement for veterans of certain prosthetic or other appliances damaged or destroyed as a result of certain accidents;

H.R. 9737. An act to amend section 641 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that deductions shall not be made from Federal payments to a State home because of amounts collected from the estates of deceased veterans and used for recreational or other purposes not required by State laws; and

H.R. 9747. An act to amend section 514(1) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 1681. An act for the relief of Gabriel Chehebar, his wife, Marcelle Levy Chehebar, and their minor children, Albert, Zakia, Zaki, Jacques, and Joseph Chehebar;

H.R. 1696. An act for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.;

H.R. 4800. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Curtis;

H.R. 9128. An act for the relief of Sgt. Ernest I. Aguilar;

H.R. 9459. An act to amend section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of Defense to settle certain claims in the amount of \$10,000 or less;

H.R. 9473. An act for the relief of Kenneth F. Miller;

H.R. 9587. An act for the relief of Anthony E. O'Sorio;

H.R. 9590. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Edward Hirsch;

H.R. 9775. An act for the relief of Nihat Ali Ucuucu;

H.R. 9832. An act for the relief of Jack Shandler;

H.R. 10111. An act for the relief of Marvin M. Greenlee;

H.R. 10160. An act for the relief of Mrs. A. R. Lendian;

H.R. 10415. An act for the relief of Earl T. Briley;

H.R. 11388. An act for the relief of Maurice Casner and Eileen G. Casner;

H.R. 11866. An act for the relief of Kim Chung Shin (Mary Rathbun);

H.R. 12024. An act for the relief of Librande P. Caltagirone;

H.R. 12090. An act for the relief of James Comeau;

H.R. 12459. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Coast Guard; and

H.R. 12701. An act for the relief of Catalina Properties, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2796. An act to provide for the renewal of certain municipal, domestic, and industrial water supply contracts entered into under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3529. An act to amend the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 857; 25 U.S.C. 406, 407), with respect to the sale of Indian timber;

H.R. 11164. An act to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the Quincy Columbia Basin Irrigation District, authorize similar contracts with any of the Columbia Basin Irrigation Districts, and to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act of 1943 (57 Stat. 14), as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11266. An act to amend the act of March 8, 1922, as amended, to extend its provisions to the townsite laws applicable in the State of Alaska;

H.R. 11543. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands adjacent to the Suitland Parkway in Prince Georges County, Md., to Suitland Lodge No. 1856, Loyal Order of Moose;

H.R. 11551. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Maryland to the Holy Cross Lutheran Church, Greenbelt, Md., and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12164. An act to provide for the establishment of the Fort St. Marks National Historic Site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5604. An act to amend the acts of May 21, 1926, and January 25, 1927, relating to the construction of certain bridges across the Delaware River, so as to authorize the use of certain funds acquired by the owners of such bridges for purposes not directly related to the maintenance and operation of such bridges and their approaches; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7781. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey by quitclaim deed a parcel of land in Prince Georges County, Md., to the Silver Hill Voluntary Fire Department and Rescue Squad;

H.R. 9957. An act to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (72 Stat. 1274; 5 U.S.C. 73b-3), relating to travel expenses of civilian officers and employees assigned to duty posts outside the continental United States;

H.R. 10134. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain land in Prince Georges County, Md., to the American National Red Cross;

H.R. 11594. An act to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments; and

H.R. 11899. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for a Federal telecommunications fund; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9914. An act for the relief of San-Man Inn of Manning, Inc.; and

H.R. 12589. An act to amend the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 11728. An act to amend section 1208 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize investment of the war risk insurance fund in securities of, or guaranteed by, the United States; placed on the calendar.

H.R. 11887. An act to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex.; and

H.R. 12416. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of chestnut extract proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 509) providing the express approval of the Congress, pursuant to section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)), for the disposition of certain materials from the national stockpile, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress expressly approve, pursuant to section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)), the disposals of 12,245 long tons of chestnut tannin extract from the national stockpile.

SEC. 2. All funds derived from the sale authorized by this concurrent resolution shall be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

GOVERNMENT FINANCING AND THE BANKS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the Washington Post this morning editorially inquires that if private business can finance through the banks, why not the Government? The editorial points out that when a business loan is made, the borrower goes to the bank and gives his note in exchange for a deposit which is set up, thus creating the equivalent of new cash.

So the editorial inquires, why cannot the Government do that just as well?

The point of difference is really payback. The private borrower goes to the bank, his profit and loss account is carefully scrutinized, his balance sheet is carefully examined, his credit is appraised, and, if found satisfactory, the loan is made. Of course, the banks do not make long-term loans. Very little

bank money is loaned for a period of more than 5 years, but most of it has a very short term. When a loan is made, the time to pay back is firmly established; and the borrower does pay it back. Thus, the payback liquidates the inflationary force of making the loan. Paybacks and new loans are being made all the time; thus, one counterbalances the other.

On the other hand, when Uncle Sam comes in to borrow, the record shows that he does not pay back; the new money is created, and it stays in circulation. This is why it is called printing-press money; and that term is used in the editorial, which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, there may be occasions when the Government must finance through the banking system; but to make a practice of it would have a highly destructive effect on Government credit and a highly inflationary effect upon the economy, thus injuring the savers, the pensioners, and all those living on fixed incomes, including the preachers, teachers, civil servants, and so on.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 21, 1962]

EXHIBIT I

FEDERAL RESERVE POLICIES: I

Few people are aware of the controversy over monetary policy which at the moment is still confined to the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee, and even fewer understand how its outcome can affect the future course of the American economy.

The principal antagonists are Chairman William McC. Martin of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and four Democratic members of the Joint Economic Committee, Messrs. WRIGHT PATMAN, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, WILLIAM PROXMIER, and HENRY S. REUSS. In the most recent hearings this group, augmented by witnesses drawn from university economics departments and banks, has carried on an animated discussion that has touched upon every aspect of monetary policy such as the relationship between the growth of total output and the growth of the money supply, the appropriate level of interest rates, and the challenge posed by our balance-of-payments deficits. But none of the issues were so vigorously debated as the role of the Federal Reserve System in the financing of Federal budgetary deficits.

The fiscal-monetary issue was joined when Mr. Martin declared that "such deficits as we may experience, whether they are due to a shortfall of receipts under the existing tax structure, an increase in expenditures, or a reduction in tax rates, should be met by borrowing from the real savings of businesses and individuals, not through the creation of money through the banking system." This strong reiteration of an earlier statement places the FRS in direct conflict with the aims of the administration, which is pledged to tax reduction in 1963, for the purpose of stimulating economic activity.

If Mr. Martin's views prevail, the efforts to stimulate the economy by means of a tax cut would be frustrated by tight money. Tax reductions would place additional funds in households and businesses, but they would soon be withdrawn when the Treasury sold bonds to the public in an effort to finance the Federal deficit out of "real savings."

Moreover, the sale of intermediate and long-term Treasury bonds would raise interest rates, thus depressing the volume of investment while the loss of reserves would diminish the ability of the commercial banks to extend loans.

While Mr. Martin softened his position during cross examination by explaining that he would not require the financing of deficits out of "real savings" on a "dollar-for-dollar basis," he nevertheless adhered to a view which equates the financing of deficits by other means with a resort to the use of "printing press money." That is a curious position in view of the process by which the bulk of the money supply is created under a system of fractional reserve banking. When a business obtains a loan, the bank creates money by exchanging a promise to repay for a checking account or demand-deposit balance, and in that manner the banking system as a whole can create a supply of checkbook money about six times as large as the total reserves which are deposited in the 12 Federal Reserve banks.

According to Mr. Martin, it is perfectly proper for the banks to finance private indebtedness by creating money, but when one suggests that public debt be handled in the same manner he alludes to the dark dangers of printing press money. Is he suggesting that the banking system should discriminate against Federal debt? It is of course true that reckless use of the bank-financed public debt would lead to inflation, but the very same stricture may be placed against bank-financed private debt.

Few if any of Mr. Martin's critics are wild-eyed proponents of inflation or fiscal irresponsibility. They ask only that he co-operate in executing the monetary aspects of a compensatory economic policy or provide a more cogent rationale for his reluctance to go along.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut discussed the lead editorial in the Washington Post of this morning. I read that editorial. I thought it was an excellent editorial, to the point, and sound. The fact is that there are times when we should finance our deficit through bank financing. There are times when we should not. There are periods when the times are inflationary. There are periods when the times are not inflationary. Now there is a high degree of unemployment. We are utilizing but 85 percent of our industrial facilities. Under those circumstances it seems sensible to have a moderate increase in the monetary supply. This is all the editorial in the Washington Post suggested. I think it makes sense. I disagree with the position expressed so ably by the Senator from Connecticut.

TRADE SURPLUS RISES TO \$5 BILLION RATE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from today's Washington Post, pointing out that the favorable balance of trade has grown to \$5 billion in the first half of this year, be printed at this point in the RECORD. This is a real accomplishment.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADE SURPLUS RISES TO \$5 BILLION RATE

Increased trade in manufactured goods was the major factor contributing to record exports and imports in the first half of 1962, the Commerce Department said yesterday, according to the Associated Press.

Exports of domestic merchandise reached a peak annual rate of \$20.9 billion in the first 6 months of the year. This represented an increase of \$700 million over the rate for the last half of 1961.

Imports increased by \$200 million to an annual rate of \$15.9 billion.

The gain in exports over imports was equal to \$5 billion on an annual rate.

[Although the United States regularly enjoys a surplus in foreign trade accounts, it also suffers a chronic deficit in its balance of international payments. This is because loans and grants to foreign nations, maintenance of overseas military personnel, private investment abroad and the excess of American tourists dollars spent overseas over foreign tourist expenditures here more than offsets the trade balance. This outgo is expected to top \$6 billion in 1962, thus wiping out the \$5 billion trade surplus and leaving the Nation with a predicted \$1 billion deficit.]

Of the \$700 million gain in exports, \$600 million reflected an increase in shipments of finished manufactured goods, which set a record of \$11.9 billion.

Manufactured goods accounted for all of the increase in imports, as they rose by \$300 million to \$5.8 billion.

JOE PFISTER NAMED COLUMBIA SHEEPMAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the selection of a citizen of my State, Joe Pfister, of Node, Wyo., as Columbia Sheepman of the Year. I ask unanimous consent that an article on the subject which appeared in the Wyoming Wool Grower of July 12, 1962, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOE PFISTER IS COLUMBIA SHEEPMAN OF THE YEAR

At the recent annual meeting of the Columbia Sheep Breeders Association of America, Joe Pfister, Node, Wyo., was named Columbia Sheepman of the Year. Since he bought his first flock in 1947, Joe has never ceased doing everything possible to improve his own flock and to promote the Columbia breed. Never has there been a purebred livestock producer more dedicated to his breed than Joe, nor one who works harder to improve it.

Joe is assisted in his Columbia enterprise by his wife, Lenore, and two sons, Charles, 11, and Johnny, 8. The Pfister Columbia flock is definitely a family affair, for Lenore and the boys are as enthusiastic about Columbias as Dad is. The entire family is almost always present at any Columbia show or sale and take an active part in helping exhibit the animals.

The boys take an active interest in the Columbia breed and both own sheep. Charles uses his Columbias in 4-H work and Johnny for his future 4-H work.

Joe's outstanding record with both his show and sale sheep has brought him a national reputation and won him the respect of Columbia breeders everywhere. His quickness to smile, friendly manner, and winning personality have made him popular with other breeders even in the most heated competition.

Joe has often been referred to as the "Lamburger King." This stems from the public relations work of introducing a portable lamburger stand at his local county ram sale, and also at the Wyoming State Fair, Douglas, Wyo. Through the publicity and attention from Joe's lamburger program, he has encouraged more people to talk about and actually eat lamb.

The entire lamburger program was unique in that it was a case of sheepmen trying to help themselves out of a predicament (poor lamb prices and lamb hard to sell over western meat counters), rather than relying on a Government program or others to do the job for them.

Joe is a charter members of the Wyoming Purebred Columbia Sheep Association and has attended all except one meeting, which was due to illness. He has served as president 4 years and has been active on the board every year.

On the national level, Joe has attended all meetings except one, and takes active sincere interest in all of the business and programs of the association. He has served on committees on the national level and was again called on this year to head up a national committee.

Joe has a long and impressive show record in both sheep and wool which few Columbia breeders can excel.

As a 4-H member and as an adult breeder, he has shown sheep and wool at major shows and fairs from Portland, Ore., to Kansas City, Mo., over the past 25 years.

Joe has the distinction of being the oldest continuous exhibitor of any kind of livestock at the Wyoming State Fair. He has shown sheep at this event every year since 1938.

His Columbia sheep and fleeces have established an amazing record of winnings at the Wyoming State Fair, which has been one of the largest and most competitive wool and breed sheep shows in the United States over the past 10 years. Joe showed his first Columbias at the Wyoming State Fair in 1948. In 1950 he showed his first champion ram at this event. He repeated this achievement for the next 10 years. He also has shown the champion ewe five times, the first-place Columbia flock five times, the first-place get of sire three times, and the reserve ram once.

He also has a very impressive record of wins at the National Columbia Show and Sale. He first took sheep to this event in 1949 and has shown sheep at the National every year since. He has won the champion ram award two times, the reserve champion ram twice, the champion ewe once, and the reserve champion ewe once. His pens of three ewes have won the championship twice and the reserve championship four straight times. Probably the most outstanding achievement he has made at the National is that in the 12 years his sheep have been shown in this event, only twice has an animal placed below eighth. When one considers that the classes range from 15 to 40 entries in class, it is easy to see that Joe's Columbias always compare very favorably with the absolute best.

There is not enough room to list the winnings of Joe's Columbias at the many fairs and sheep shows where they have been shown. However, wherever his Columbias have been, they have won a major share of the championships and top awards.

Pfisters' Columbia fleeces have walked away with championship ribbons and other awards in top wool shows all over the country, bringing much fame to both Joe's flock and the Columbia breed in competition with fleeces from other major breeds. Joe's fleeces have been shown at the National Western Stock Show in Denver, the American Royal at Kansas City, the Pacific International at Portland, the Northwest Nebraska Wool Show at Crawford, Nebr., the Wyoming State Fair, and at various county fairs and local shows.

Joe has shown Columbia fleeces at the National Western Stock Show for many years, and they have won many top awards there. In 1961, he made a complete sweep of this wool show, winning the grand champion and fleece awards of the entire show (all breeds and classes). He also won the champion Columbia fleece and the champion ram flock fleece. His entries placed first in the

best five fleeces shown by one exhibitor, first in the best four fleeces shown by one exhibitor, and first in the farm flock one-half, three-eighths, and one-fourth blood classes. In 1959 he showed the champion Columbia ram fleece and the reserve grand champion fleece of the show. In 1955, he showed the Columbia farm flock fleece.

At the Wyoming State Fair he has entered fleeces every year since 1952. He has exhibited the grand champion fleece of this show four times and the reserve grand champion five times. Since 1958, he has exhibited the champion Columbia ram fleece every year. He has won the champion Columbia ewe fleece twice, the champion farm flock fleece three times, and the champion farm flock ewe twice. An example of how Pfister fleeces often sweep a wool show came in 1959 and 1961. His Columbia fleeces won the championship in every department in which they could be entered, including the Columbia breed, farm flock, and overall classes. No other breeder has ever accomplished this feat in the past 15 years.

Joe is a valued member of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association and has been a consistent consignor at the Wyoming ram sale.

An outstanding 4-H Club member as a youth, Joe is now involved in his eighth year as a 4-H Club leader. His advice, counsel, and help in leading 4-H boys and girls in sheep projects and his help in many 4-H activities has been of immeasurable assistance to the 4-H program.

He has judged 4-H sheep showmanship contests at county fairs for many years and is considered the best at sheep showmanship contests. A master at fitting and showing sheep himself he has presented many demonstrations on fitting and showing sheep to boys and girls not only in his county, but in adjoining counties as well.

For the past several years he has given of his knowledge of wool, in helping train 4-H members in wool judging. A capable wool judge himself, he has been of great help to his community in this activity.

Joe has furnished excellent classes of Columbias for livestock judging training every year since he began breeding them. Joe is never too busy to take time out to provide sheep for judging training, often hauling them many miles to where judging training meetings are held. He has started many 4-H boys and girls with good Columbias. He has bred their ewes when they could not afford a ram, and sold them top stud rams at reduced prices. No problem is too small for his undivided attention in working with boys and girls, and he takes a sincere interest and pride in their progress. He is indeed a top 4-H leader and the 4-H program owes much to this cooperation, knowledge, and assistance.

The most outstanding feature of Joe Pfister's career and his success as a Columbia breeder, is the fact that this was attained entirely through his own hard work, perseverance, and ability. From a very small beginning and with very little or almost no financial assistance, he has built an outstanding flock of Columbia sheep of national prominence in a short space of 15 years.

Columbia's are not only his business, they are the hobby and the lifework of Joe Pfister, Columbia Sheepman of the Year.

AGRICULTURE PROBLEMS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, for too long the problems of the American farmer have been compounded by the refusal to face the hard facts of agricultural economics in the United States.

The truth is, if we will admit it, that the American farmer is caught in a vise that effectively eliminates any possibility of his survival on the open world market.

The two jaws of this vise are the low world market price on one hand and the high protected price of all the equipment he must buy on the other. In short, our farmers must sell their crops at low world prices while almost everything he buys costs more than it would any other place in the world. In the jaws of this vise the individual farmer, the family farmer if you will, cannot exist without some help. And providing that help is the express purpose of our farm program.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, our present farm program has not taken into account the ingenuity of the American farmer. Typical of traditional American enterprise he has learned to grow more and more crops on less and less land, and we wind up with not only low prices but large surpluses.

Since we cannot eliminate the individual farmer by throwing him to the mercy of the open market, we must devise a program that will give him the needed protection at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayer. Mr. President, I believe such a program can be found in the combination of rigid support prices and strict crop controls. There is little need for argument to demonstrate the need for crop supports.

Despite the protestations of some farm groups for a return to free markets, a look at the world price for grains as compared with what our farmers insist they must have to survive, should convince everyone that to eliminate these supports would be to eliminate the individual farmer.

I am not pleased with the prospect of the continuation of price supports but this fact—a necessary evil—is far superior to the alternative, which is the industrialization of our farms into huge combines where machines and a very few men control vast acres with effects upon farm production quality and prices that are a nightmare to the imagination.

Since a large segment of American agriculture is dependent upon price supports for its continued existence, it is only fair that as the farmer needs protection on prices he accept it in its least costly form. To do this he must accept production controls.

To me the height of folly is to support prices without regard to production so that in turn we may give the taxpayer the privilege of paying storage costs on large farm surpluses. The advantages of production controls—strictly applied—are obvious. We may spend the same amount in supporting the concept of individual farms but save the large expense of crop storage. Thus, we can reduce our surpluses to manageable levels and do away with a program that by its very size and complexity has lent itself to the machinations of those who would abuse their trust and seek dishonest profit at the public's expense. Also this program would take land out of production, thereby preserving its potential for the future when all our agricultural resources may be needed or allowing its conversion to badly needed recreational or watershed uses.

The criticism of this program is, of course, that it inflicts tight Government controls—regimentation is a favorite word—on a segment of our free economy.

And I say that this is certainly true. But I also say that freedom from these controls is freedom to leave the farm and head for the city to find a job. To remain on the farm, the farmer needs a supported price which he should accept in the least expensive and most efficient manner. Growing mountains of unneeded grains is not what I regard as efficiency.

I have stated that the prime consideration in price support legislation is the preservation of the individually owned and operated farm. In other words, we are attempting to preserve the job of being a farmer. To me a farmer is someone who works full time at the job of farming—who spends his time on the land working it for what best he can produce. However, there are many persons who benefit under present farm legislation who do not fit this definition. They are what I would call the "briefcase" farmer. For them owning and operating a farm is a diversion, a recreation, or a means of acquiring a beneficial tax write-off. In any event, farming is not their full-time occupation.

I am not opposed to a businessman finding rest and relaxation on a farm, nor am I opposed to his acquiring a "place in the country" for his family or in his search for status. I am opposed to his accepting Federal supports, designed to keep the full-time farmer in business, for what to him is an unessential diversion. And I find the Government twice burdened by the man who operates a farm as a tax writeoff. The spectacle of subsidy payments to a man perpetrating a scheme to escape his just taxes is most unpleasant. There I would suggest that the Congress consider limiting farm supports to bona fide farmers.

The bill now under consideration in the Senate does not take up all the points which I have mentioned here. It does, however, represent a considerable start toward what I would hope is an efficient approach to our farm problems. The mandatory feed grain program was, I believe a constructive approach to one of our most perplexing surpluses. I am extremely disappointed to hear that it has been abandoned. The alternative, extension of the voluntary feed grains program, has shown surpluses can be reduced by crop controls. But in this case, the incentive payments will soon run into astronomical figures unless the plan is superseded by a mandatory program. I reluctantly support this alternative, however, because the other choice is a return to the law of 1958 which was responsible for the rapid growth of the feed grain surplus in the first place. I note that those who oppose the mandatory program are the same people—members of the same party—who have attempted to make an issue of fiscal responsibility in our Government.

Mr. President, I am in favor of fiscal responsibility as is the party I represent; and I suggest that here is a good time for some members to practice what they preach. I also would note that these same people, who now give their support to a voluntary system are in many cases the very same people who opposed voluntary plans when they first were submitted to the Congress.

Mr. President, I support another section of the bill, the wheat certificate program. This is a significant attempt to reduce our carryover wheat supplies while at the same time adjusting the program to the multimarket features of our wheat production and consumption. This bill does away with the minimum acreage requirements in existing legislation. I would point out that in the 20 years this minimum figure of 55 million acres has been in effect the yield per acre has doubled.

I am pleased to note that while reductions in wheat are calculated in terms of acreage for the farmer, he would receive his support payment on certificates based on bushel allotments. The farmers in Wyoming and much of the West do not have the abundance of rich soil and adequate rainfall that occur in other areas of the country. Therefore, they cannot, by intensive farming or the addition of more fertilizer, increase the production per acre to compensate for reduced allotments.

Mr. President, while we are considering the farm bill we tend to become wrapped up in a problem which is unique in the world and forget that it is a problem which should not exist at all. We all must remember that the real farm problem in this world is not surpluses but a critical lack of food—starvation and malnutrition would best describe the end results of much of the world's agriculture. While we here are attempting to reduce embarrassing piles of grain and devise voluntary and mandatory programs to limit production of everything from turkeys to turnips, two-thirds of the world's population—that is two of every three human beings—is not getting enough to eat.

I realize that it is necessary to solve the immediate problems of overproduction here in the United States, but it is just as imperative that we work equally hard to eliminate those many factors—tariff considerations, pricing, transportation, and many more—which prevent us from sharing our abundance with the less productive nations so that without supports and through normal trade our farmers may again earn an honest livelihood without artificial supports. Until that day we must support the individual farm and the independent farmer. But it is our obligation to those who pay for this support to effect the most efficient programs possible. Therefore, I suggest we face the facts of this problem and approve a farm bill which will do the job. I believe that the bill the Senate is now considering is a positive step toward a realistic bill, and I urge its passage.

NOMINATION OF THURGOOD MARSHALL TO BE A U.S. JUDGE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, this morning I was shocked to learn that a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary has decided to postpone indefinitely hearings on Judge Thurgood Marshall's nomination. I have spoken previously on this subject. In spite of my reluctance to take this stand, if the committee to which this nomination has been

assigned for action continues indefinitely not to take action, I believe the time is practically at hand when the Senate must speak up on the matter.

It is thoroughly clear that the nomination of Judge Thurgood Marshall is not being measured with the same yardstick that has been applied to other nominees for Federal appointments. He was appointed in September of 1961. After the Senate convened, he was reappointed, to conform to the law. Practically 1 year has elapsed since this man was given an assignment to a Federal judgeship, and in this 1 year no action has been taken by the Judiciary Committee on the appointment. He is entitled to the same type of treatment received by any other American citizen appointed to a Federal post. He is not receiving it.

I humbly suggest to the majority leader that the time has come when, for the maintenance of the honor of the Senate, action should be pursued, and, in my judgment, the committee relieved of further consideration of the nomination, and that it be assigned directly to the Senate for action.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Ohio has just said, and insofar as the leadership is concerned, we intend to make every effort to get the nomination to the floor before Congress adjourns, and, we hope, acted upon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am of the opinion that the Senator from Ohio may be in error. While I am not a member of the subcommittee, I have been following the matter very closely. I believe it may have concluded testimony yesterday morning. It now remains for the subcommittee to report the nomination to the full committee, either with or without recommendation.

I have discussed the matter with other members of the Judiciary Committee on the other side of the aisle. It is our hope that we can get the nomination to the full committee at its very next meeting for consideration, and have a report to the Senate, so that, if there are any objections, if any Senator wants to discuss the case at length, it can better be done here than in committee. So, speaking as a member of the full committee, I am most anxious that we get the nomination to the floor without delay.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I hope the Senator from Illinois is correct. The announcement was made on television this morning that there had been an indefinite postponement of action. I made my statement on the basis of that information. I am glad to hear what the Senator from Illinois has said, and, of course, what the majority leader has just said on the subject; but the fact is that the delay is too great even as of now, in my judgment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Ohio. I may add that I discussed this matter yesterday afternoon with the chairman of the

Judiciary Committee, and I know he believes as I do with respect to this delay.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am extremely heartened by what the minority leader has just said. I hope it will be possible very shortly to bring the nomination to the floor for consideration and debate.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Madam President, earlier today the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] made a comment with reference to the failure of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary to accord to the nomination of Mr. Thurgood Marshall the same standards and the same consideration that had been accorded other nominees. The Senator expressed due and proper concern over that situation. I did not have the opportunity then to join with the Senator and express my concurrence and support of the opinions and attitudes which he expressed.

I say to the Senator from Ohio that all nominees whose nominations are before any committee in which there is a process of confirmation should be accorded equal rights, equal privileges and equal treatment. I believe that if we examine the nominations considered by the Judiciary Committee, we will find that Thurgood Marshall has been tested, interrogated, and screened far more assiduously and intensely than most other nominees. I wish to make it quite clear that as one Senator I will do everything I can to assure that Mr. Marshall is given fair, responsible, and equal treatment, and that the question of the confirmation of the nomination is brought before the Senate for the purpose of a yea-and-nay vote. Mr. Marshall has a right to know whether or not his nomination will be confirmed by the vote of the Senate.

He should not be subjected to delaying tactics, if that is the case, by any committee or subcommittee. I wish to join with the Senator from Ohio and other Senators who have expressed concern over this subject. The majority leader has given to the Senate very reassuring words. I know it is his view, as he expressed it, that the Senate will work its will on the nomination of Thurgood Marshall. Judging from what I know of his background and his competency, Thurgood Marshall is a good man. His nomination should be confirmed. Unless there is information to the contrary, I would support him, and do support him actively and willingly. I hope his nomination will be before the Senate promptly. There are ways of getting the nomination before this body, and those ways have been used before.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Madam President, I compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota on his statement.

In my judgment there is no reason why the Committee on the Judiciary should not have reported the nomination of this fine judge to the Senate. I hope that very shortly the nomination will be favorably reported and will be confirmed by the Senate. As the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has stated, a yea and nay vote should be had on the nomination, so that we may stand up and be counted. I am sure that the

overwhelming majority of the Senate will vote to confirm the nomination of this fine loyal American and experienced lawyer and judge to the position to which he has been nominated by our President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, if the Senator from Minnesota has any influence whatsoever in the councils of the Democratic Party, this nomination will be brought before the Senate so that each Senator may cast his vote. Thurgood Marshall is entitled to that consideration. He has already suffered enough indignities. It is our duty as well as our privilege and responsibility to act one way or another on this nomination. I find in Thurgood Marshall a good man, a competent man, one who is entitled to assume the responsibility of being a Federal judge, to which position he has been nominated by President Kennedy.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am glad to hear the Senator say that. I know he will do what he can to expedite consideration of this nomination.

Mr. HART. Madam President, I was not in the Chamber at the time the majority leader addressed himself to the subject of the nomination of Thurgood Marshall to be a judge of the court of appeals for the second circuit. I heard the distinguished Senator from Minnesota say that the majority leader had expressed concern at the delay in reporting the nomination, and his determination that the Senate shall be given an opportunity to act on the nomination. I am delighted to hear that.

I am not a member of the subcommittee considering the nomination of Thurgood Marshall, but as a member of the full Committee on the Judiciary, I have sat with the subcommittee in its deliberations, as has the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. As I said yesterday, when someone gets around to writing a book on the weird performances of the Senate, most assuredly one chapter will recite the case that we are now discussing; namely, the nomination of Thurgood Marshall, the consideration that was given to it, and the time that was taken on it. I am sure the happy last paragraph will show the confirmation of the nomination of this distinguished member of the American bar.

The suffering will be less that of Thurgood Marshall than of the Senate. Spending months looking for flaws in the professional integrity of this man is like spending months looking for an elephant in a bathtub; his integrity is either there or it is not there on the day the nomination is made. I do not know of any other living member of the American bar whose batting average before the Supreme Court is as high as that of Thurgood Marshall. In that, of course, lies some of the problem. The Senate cannot continue to fumble and fuss over this nomination. Thurgood Marshall's place in American jurisprudence is long established.

I restrain myself with great difficulty lest I comment upon the scene in which some lawyers have been attempting to determine whether Thurgood Marshall qualifies as a judge. Let us be through

with this business. Let us write the ultimate paragraph, which is confirmation of the nomination. I would be hard pressed to find a name in the brilliant list of able American lawyers which could successfully contest the claim which Thurgood Marshall would never make but which can be made for him; namely, that he is as brilliant a member of the American bar as there is alive today.

I am delighted that the majority leader has indicated that we shall soon be about this business. I trust, as I know the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] does, that our committee will act promptly and responsibly. However, neither he nor I, disagreeable though the chore may be, will have any reluctance or hesitancy, if the committee fails to act, in seeking the support of the Senate to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the nomination. The President of the United States has sent to the Senate a distinguished name. Let the Senate now promptly confirm the nomination of this fine judge.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, as one who has been working for approval of this nomination for a long time, I wish to express my gratitude to the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished assistant majority leader, and other Senators who have spoken today.

It was my hope that the normal channels which are followed in these matters would be followed in this case and that we would have an opportunity to vote on the question of the confirmation of the nomination of this distinguished lawyer and jurist in a prompt and orderly manner. That is the way it should have been done.

I am bound to say to the Senate, however, that such has not been the case to date. A great many extraneous matters have been gone into at a series of subcommittee hearings which have had virtually nothing to do with the qualifications of the nominee. At the last hearing, yesterday, after the extraordinary performance was indulged in of reading a speech which in part attributed statements to Judge Marshall which he denied ever having made, the chairman of the subcommittee stated that it would be necessary to call the man who had made the speech. This is taking place after 8 months during which the nomination has been lying in committee and 10 months since Judge Marshall was appointed to the court. At this late date, it seems obvious that this unlawyerlike procedure is simply designed to further delay the conclusion of the hearings.

This is nothing more than an adroit procedure for stringing out the hearings and if successful, could prolong them forever.

Following that subcommittee hearing, abortive, like so many others were before it, I attended a meeting of the full Committee on the Judiciary on the drug bill. Concededly this meeting was called for the purpose of completing action on the drug bill. At the conclusion of ac-

tion on the drug bill, however, I sought recognition from the chairman of the full committee for the purpose of making a motion to discharge the subcommittee from further consideration of the Marshall nomination. I was gavelled down and not recognized.

I have now asked the chairman to place the motion to discharge the subcommittee on the committee's agenda. If at the next meeting, again I am not recognized, I shall join with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], from the full committee; with my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who has shown a deep interest in this question; and, I am sure, with other Senators on both sides of the aisle, in a motion in the Senate to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of the nomination of Thurgood Marshall. As a member of the committee, I would regret being forced to take such action. It should not be necessary. But those who oppose the nomination of Judge Marshall have had more than an ample opportunity to express their opposition and now it is time for the Senate to pass upon the question. We know that the nomination will be overwhelmingly approved by this body.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I commend the Senator from New York and the Senator from Michigan for the course of action they are following in the Committee on the Judiciary. In case the subcommittee does not report the Marshall nomination either favorably or unfavorably to the full committee, and the full committee does not report the nomination either favorably or unfavorably to the Senate within the immediate future, the senior Senator from Oregon would like to join with the Senator from New York as a cosponsor of any motion he may make in the Senate to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of the Marshall nomination.

It would be rather ironical if the Marshall nomination were permitted to die in committee at this session of Congress when the Senate as a whole was willing to impose a gag rule on a group in the Senate who were willing to bring our opposition into the open on the floor of the Senate for full debate by this body, a body which should be the last body of untrammelled, free debate in the world.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I am appreciative of the views of the distinguished Senator from Oregon on this nomination; they are exactly what I would expect of him. If the Senate were not permitted at this session to pass upon the nomination of Thurgood Marshall, as the Senator from Michigan has said, it would be a reflection, not upon Judge Marshall, but upon the United States Senate. I feel certain that those of us who support this nomination will not permit that to happen.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I desire the record to be clear that the majority leader and the Senator from Minnesota have made it perfectly clear today that action will be taken on this nomination. It is our hope that such action can be taken through the normal processes of the committees; but it has been made manifestly clear that there is no intention of letting the nomination die without permitting the Senate to exercise its will upon the nomination. The will of the Senate will be determined by a ye-and-nay vote. I have said that I support the nomination. I say again that the evidence we have had before us this morning, in the responses from Senators, indicates that there is a real desire on the part of the Senate to move ahead and fulfill our responsibility under the confirmation process of the Senate. It will be done.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, it is very reassuring to have this statement from the assistant majority leader and a similar statement from the majority leader. I am confident that with their strong support, this action will be accomplished and that a blot will not be permitted to mar the escutcheon of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I think the whole country will be grateful to my colleague [Mr. KEATING], to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], to the majority leader, to the assistant majority leader, and to all other Senators who have been fighting for this nomination.

First, the nominee is a judge of very high attainments. We who come from New York know him well, have worked with him, and understand his capacity. But beyond that, the only thing that anyone had to fear was that the people would not be aroused in time, because if the Senate did not act, Judge Marshall would lose his place. If he were again appointed for an interim, he would have to serve without compensation. He cannot afford to be without compensation. That is a very disabling circumstance. Also, to accept another such appointment would be very humiliating to a judge who is so good and who is now sitting on the bench, acting on cases.

But with the assurances we now have, we are confident that action will be taken by the Senate. I know that we all have the greatest confidence in a Senate vote. I think the whole country must be grateful to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], who, notwithstanding the fact that they are not members of the subcommittee, have nonetheless made their presence so unmistakably clear.

The reputation of a man is as precious to our society as is his life. That is precisely what distinguished Senators are fighting to preserve inviolate and secure. That is a very noble position to take, and it is a fine thing for the country. I am

delighted at long last to see that the problem is being faced so realistically and frankly and directly in this Chamber, where it is easy to gloss over this very unhappy, seamy phase of life. I am deeply grateful to my colleague from New York. If he does nothing else in the Senate, he will have performed a great good for our State in the fight he is waging for Thurgood Marshall.

Like the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I shall be prepared to join in a discharge motion if necessary. Any Senator would be honored to make it, but the honor properly belongs to a member of the committee who has waged the fight. We all understand that. I am confident that the nomination of Thurgood Marshall will be confirmed. It is being made clear and unmistakable on the record that such action would be to our credit. It does not have to be forced. Many champions are fighting the battle, whatever may be said about the obfuscation and delay which have so far prevailed.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I express gratitude to my colleague from New York for his kind remarks. No one has been more interested in seeing that justice is accomplished with respect to the nomination of Thurgood Marshall than has my distinguished colleague from New York. His support in this fight has been of inestimable value.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

PROPOSED TRIP OF VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON TO THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished Vice President will be departing shortly on an official mission to the Middle East. He goes at the behest of the President, to an area in which a delicate balance between peace and war has prevailed for many years. He goes to express the friendly interest of this Nation to the friendly nations of that region.

We have already had evidence of the great capacity of the Vice President to convey the warmth, the spontaneity, the good heart of the American people to other peoples. His visits to Africa, southeast Asia, and Berlin were outstanding achievements in the building of international good will.

Mr. President, I know that I speak for the entire Senate in extending to our colleague and presiding officer and to Mrs. Johnson and their party the best wishes of this body for a safe and worthwhile journey. He carries with him the high confidence of the Senate even as he does that of the President in the arduous, delicate, and significant mission on which he is about to embark.

PIRATING BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OF EMPLOYEES OF STATE OF OHIO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, without identifying the official or the department of the State of Ohio from which I received the communications to which

I wish to refer, I want to point out the substance of them. The complaint of this official of Ohio is that the Federal Government is in the process of constantly pirating employees of the State of Ohio. The official's letter came from the State of Ohio on July 17, and pointed out that during the months of June and July this department of the government of the State of Ohio lost to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife three employees of the State.

On August 17 this same official wrote to me and stated that two more employees of the State of Ohio had been taken over by the Federal Government. In his last letter this man stated, among other things:

Certainly Congress cannot be seriously considering a further increase in the pay of Government workers.

I would venture to say that if we traveled around the country we would find this same condition existing in practically every State; that is, a disparity in the wage scales paid as between the Federal Government and the States. The States are not now able to compete with the Federal Government, yet it is proposed that a very substantial pay raise be granted, on the Federal level, which would create an aggravated disparity and not in the end solve the problem. It is a mad race—the Federal Government pirating from private industry, private industry pirating from the Federal Government—and the end never comes.

I think this letter is most appropriate. For emphasis I want to repeat:

Certainly Congress cannot be seriously considering a further increase in the pay of Government workers.

There are positions in which increases may be warranted, but certainly not on an across-the-board basis.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, one of the most conscientious, hard-working, and diligent Members of this body is the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. He has been the subject of great criticism because of the fact that he has attended to his duties assiduously as the chairman of the District of Columbia Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. I know that what he is trying to do is a good job, a fair job, and a decent job. I think he should be commended for the interest he has shown in the problems of the District of Columbia. It is not a pleasant assignment, but somebody has to look into the matters which come to the attention of that particular subcommittee, and in my opinion the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is to be complimented for the diligence which he has shown.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news story carried in the New York Times of the 19th of this month entitled "Welfare Mess in Capital Spurs National Inquiry," may be incorporated in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELFARE MESS IN CAPITAL SPURS NATIONAL INQUIRY—SENATE STUDY FINDS MANY ON DISTRICT'S ROLLS INELIGIBLE—\$18 MILLION LOSS CITED

(By Marjorie Hunter)

WASHINGTON, August 18.—A welfare mess in Washington has prompted the Kennedy administration to step up efforts to remove ineligible from the Nation's public relief rolls.

Is there wholesale welfare cheating? Officials of Newburgh, N.Y., said last year there was, but failed to prove it.

Now, with a multimillion-dollar welfare scandal unfolding in the Nation's Capital, Federal officials have ordered a nationwide examination of local relief rolls.

It has been estimated by Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, that at least \$18 million in relief has been paid to ineligible in the District of Columbia in the last 5 years.

It was Senator BYRD, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, who lit the match under the District's welfare program and produced both smoke and fire.

SUSPICIONS AROUSED

At first, there was only smoke. Suspicious because District welfare officials kept asking for supplemental funds at a time when the city's population was declining, Senator BYRD sought figures and facts during District budget hearings last year.

Some accused him of being anti-Negro, some of being antiwelfare. He was likened to Joseph McD. Mitchell, the Newburgh city manager, who had attempted to establish a get tough welfare code for his Hudson Valley city last year.

Late last month, the Byrd subcommittee began hearings on the District \$22 million welfare budget requests for the current fiscal year. This time, Senator BYRD and his staff were prepared to show there was fire, too.

Investigators, both from the District Welfare Department and the General Accounting Office, which reports to Congress on expenditures, said that a random sampling of 280 aid-to-dependent-children cases showed that 57 percent were ineligible for relief funds.

Among the reported cases were:

A mother of four children who had been receiving welfare payments for 4 years. She said the man living with her was her brother, but it was determined that he was the father of two of her children. She had been receiving \$154 a month. The man was earning \$85 a week.

A mother of six children was getting a monthly welfare check of \$191. She said the man living with her was a brother-in-law, but he actually was her husband and he had a job paying \$65 a week.

A mother of four children had been receiving \$109 a month. Investigators found a man hiding in the bathroom and he admitted he had been living with the woman. (A District welfare regulation prohibits relief payments to a family if the mother has a continuing relationship with her husband or any other man.)

A mother of four had been receiving \$205 a month from welfare. Investigators learned that she earned \$20 a week and also was receiving \$10 a week from a boy friend for payments on a \$419.90 television set.

The well-furnished apartment of one woman on relief, contained a three-speed record player, a television set, two telephones, a typewriter, and a radio.

In the homes of 102 relief families were 136 telephones. One home had three separate telephone lines.

In 155 homes of relief families there were 167 television sets. There were 2 sets in 12 of the homes.

The Comptroller General, Joseph Campbell, head of General Accounting Office, said investigations showed that the District Welfare Department had been poorly administered, that social workers were lax and that the cheating by relief mothers was flagrant.

Some of the sternest criticism came from within the District Welfare Department itself. Bernard W. Scholz, head of the Public Assistance Division, said both the District and the Federal Government had been operating for 20 years on the theory that a review of records provided adequate controls.

"That is why I am shocked by the findings of the investigators," he told the Byrd subcommittee last week. "Everything on paper showed we were doing a good job."

He attributed much of the trouble to untrained personnel, who dispense thousands of dollars every month.

He also said that more snoopers are needed to determine eligibility of welfare clients.

The "friend at the door" philosophy was warranted in the 1930's, when truly nice people needed help, Mr. Scholz told the committee.

THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM— ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over the years we have had a continuing search for ways to clarify the objectives of aid and to administer the foreign aid programs in a more effective fashion. The search is by no means over although there have been some improvements.

In this connection, I call attention to a speech by the President's special representative and adviser on African, Asian, and Latin American affairs, Mr. Chester Bowles. Mr. Bowles advances certain thoughtful ideas on aid administration with particular reference to the question of how to give fuller expression to the congressional intent which is embodied in aid legislation. These ideas seem to me to be worth careful study in the executive branch and by Members of Congress. They could be helpful in avoiding waste and in increasing the effectiveness of the contribution of foreign aid to foreign policy. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech previously referred to be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE CHESTER BOWLES, PRESIDENT'S SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE AND ADVISER ON AFRICAN, ASIAN, AND LATIN AMERICAN AFFAIRS, AT THE NINTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, THE PALMER HOUSE, CHICAGO, ILL., THURSDAY, JULY 19, 1962

Our theme today is the Alliance for Progress. Through this partnership we are engaged in the greatest common effort that the American people, north and south, have ever undertaken.

Our goal is the creation of a truly "new world," in which the aim of freedom, progress and justice which has inspired the peoples of the Americas for nearly five centuries will move steadily toward realization.

Yet in a very real sense this vast enterprise is only part of a worldwide alliance for progress which may be spelled in many languages—an alliance which we hope may increasingly tie the United States and its people to the nations and people not only of Latin America but of Asia and Africa as well.

Our U.S. foreign aid program is an integral part of a global effort involving many of the industrialized free nations, which now contribute capital goods and technicians to speed the development of the less privileged two-thirds of mankind.

By and large this unprecedented effort has been extraordinarily successful. In Pakistan, India, Colombia, Venezuela, Israel, Formosa, Nigeria, and many other developing nations, schools, clinics and roads are being built, malaria eliminated, and agricultural improvements spread through rural extension services, as part of a vast new effort at nation building.

Yet despite these and many other examples of progress our foreign aid program is still regarded with skepticism and even hostility by many Americans.

What is particularly disturbing are the criticisms of many sober observers who agree that faster economic and social progress in the developing nations is essential, but who question the effectiveness of some aspects of the programs itself.

Why is it that our foreign aid program, despite its acceptance as a vital element of American foreign policy by almost every responsible leader in each political party, remains a subject of intense congressional debate and critical public comment?

One reason has been a general failure to recognize the clarity and sophistication with which Congress has laid down the guidelines for the program, and the extent to which we have moved away from these guidelines under political pressures.

Another reason, in my opinion, is that many of us have only begun to recognize that the process of nation building is inevitably long and tedious and that dramatic results cannot be achieved quickly. This has often led to frustration and disillusionment with the whole developmental process.

Moreover, in the 1950's we were dazzled by the success of the Marshall plan in helping to rebuild Western Europe and unprepared to deal as realistically as we should have been with the quite different challenge of economic development in the underdeveloped continents.

Ten years of experience have now taught us that economic development is necessarily linked to social development, that both are incredibly complex, and that indigenous built-in factors over which we have no control may profoundly affect the final result.

As we consider developments in Asia, Africa, and Latin America our minds boggle at the staggering variety of economic and social problems with which our aid programs must cope.

However, when we look beyond these obvious differences, we see that the problems of the developing nations are remarkably similar in several important ways.

For instance, the vast majority of the people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America live in rural areas. This means that the framework of their lives is largely shaped by such fundamental conditions as weather, soil, land ownership, disease, and illiteracy.

Most rural peoples are in a constant struggle against the exploitation of landlords and moneylenders.

As the sons of peasant families crowd into the great cities in search of jobs that will pay them their first cash wage, slum housing becomes steadily more crowded.

Young, idealistic university students, frustrated at the injustice which they see on

all sides, parade and protest for change—any change—from the sterile and hated status quo.

With relatively few exceptions harried governments lack the financial experience, civil service organization, and the political strength quickly to break the chains of backwardness and prejudice that bind their people.

This political, economic, and social pattern is well established on all three developing continents. It will not be easy to change. Yet if we are to live in a rational world in which all men can enjoy a greater measure of opportunity and dignity, sweeping changes must come.

How can this be accomplished? In particular how can our economic assistance programs contribute with increasing effectiveness to the process of peaceful change—in Asia and Africa as well as in Latin America?

During the past 18 months the structure of the Agency for International Development has been thoroughly overhauled. New and vigorous individuals have assumed positions of responsibility.

I believe that our machinery is now tooled up and ready to go. The pertinent question, therefore, is: Where is it going?

In my opinion the next forward step is the establishment of a series of basic operating principles which will enable the recipients of our aid, the Congress, and the American people, clearly to understand what we are striving to accomplish and how we intend to accomplish it.

I believe that our experience over the last 10 years provides us with the essential understanding to establish such guidelines. Moreover, this effort has been made easier for us by the fact that the basis for a coherent, consistent, effective development program was laid down by Congress in the Act for International Development of 1961.

Our task is to draw directly from this basic source of authority, to develop criteria that meet the congressional intent, and, except in the face of overriding political consideration, to apply these criteria with courage and consistency in allocating loans, grants, and technical help.

This will not be a simple matter. The political pressures that surround the decision-making process are powerful and persistent. Most relationships throughout the world are in a state of flux. Irritations and frustrations with other governments and individual leaders may produce sudden and unpredictable swings of congressional and public opinion.

In view of these conditions it would be wishful thinking to assume that we can lay down some neat inviolable rules for the operation of all of our aid programs, turn them over to the IBM machines, and await the results.

The most carefully designed guidelines rooted in the most thoughtful congressional language will not allow for all contingencies. There will be many situations where we will have no alternative but to throw away the book and exercise our judgment.

Yet if the guidelines to which I refer can be made to shape no more than 80 percent of our administrative decisions the economic development programs will have been made much more acceptable to Congress, more understandable to the American people, and vastly more effective in their contribution to a more rational world.

Against this background let us consider five key guidelines, each based on the legislation passed by Congress, which I personally believe would help to bring new consistency and effectiveness to our efforts.

1. The objective of the program is the development of independent nations each capable of exercising the maximum freedom of choice within the framework of its own culture. I say "objective" rather than "objectives" because one factor which has

often weakened our efforts in recent years has been our temptation to make the program serve several different and often competitive objectives.

Whatever the byproducts which may flow from a successful aid program, at heart there is only one fundamental objective, which Congress has made abundantly clear. In last year's Act for International Development the purpose of foreign aid was spelled out in the following terms:

To help the peoples of less developed countries "to develop their resources and improve their living standards, to realize their aspirations for justice, education, dignity and respect as individual human beings, and to establish responsible governments."

Congress stressed that this effort would serve to strengthen the forces of freedom and peace on which the survival of free institutions depend.

Congress did not say or imply that economic assistance is expected to buy friends or allies. There is no suggestion that those who sometimes disagree with us in the United Nations are unworthy of our help.

In giving development assistance—as distinguished from military assistance—the congressional directive is simple and clear: to assist in the creation of vigorous independent nations, working to develop their own cultures, as an essential step toward an enlarged community of free and self-reliant nations.

I might add that wherever, in America or abroad, I have spoken of the objective of our economic assistance program in these simple, uncomplicated, human terms, I have found understanding and agreement.

2. Economic growth by itself will not achieve our objective of free independent societies.

Once again Congress has made its intentions clear in the law: economic aid should be concentrated on those countries which are "showing a responsiveness to the vital economic, political, and social concerns" of their peoples.

This congressional directive reflects the knowledge that additional output by itself will not result in a stable, peaceful, happy society.

There is nothing soothing or inherently stabilizing, for instance, about a new steel mill; in an agricultural community it may be a politically and socially disruptive force.

Although industrial expansion is essential, it is only part of the answer to the challenge of the developing nations. This is dramatically apparent in Latin America.

The per capita income among the Latin American countries varies widely. Some have an average per capita income that exceeds those of several European countries. Others are among the poorest in the world. The per capita gross national product of Venezuela, for example is larger than that of Austria; that of Bolivia is less than that of India.

Yet in Latin America as a whole there is no correlation between economic growth and political stability. The richest countries may be as politically explosive as the poorest.

If increased economic capacity does not in itself assure a forward looking, stable society, what added ingredients are required?

A study of the characteristics of developing nations throughout the world suggests the answer: responsible, effective governments are most likely to appear in those nations with a sense of individual justice and participation in the great task of nation building.

When this conference was organized a decade ago, the name it chose—the National Conference on International Economic and Social Development—reflected an understanding of an essential fact which at that time was only dimly realized by most Americans: that true development must be both economic and social.

And, I would add, political, as well. Not political in terms of international diplomatic maneuvering or in the context of the cold war struggle, but political in terms of domestic institutions which create an informed and constructively motivated citizenry.

In one word, Congress has stressed and experience has proven that the proper concern of our aid program should be with people—not just a privileged few people, favored by outmoded economic and social systems—but with all of the people.

In many countries during the earlier years of the aid program our principal focus outside of the technical assistance program was the minority who live in the cities, where problems were apparent and more easily prescribed for. Yet now we recognize that it is the 75 percent of the people who live in the villages that will largely shape the political and economic future of Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

Congress recognized this central but often neglected fact when it laid down the following directive in the AID legislation:

"Whenever the President determines that the economy of any country is in major part of an agrarian economy, emphasis shall be placed on programs which reach the people in such country who are engaged in agrarian pursuits or who live in the villages or rural areas."

Fortunately it is in the rural areas of the world that the forces of freedom have the greatest advantage.

Which nations—the free or the Communist—now have the agricultural abundance and which have the shortages?

In what kind of societies is the farmer most likely to own his own land and to live his own life? Which, in short, has the most to offer to the man with the hoe? Here is a contest which we Americans can approach with confidence.

3. The congressional language in the AID legislation provides a clear basis for more specific criteria to direct our AID administrators in the programming of loans, grants, and technical assistance.

Without such criteria we can become a prey to every kind of pressure and persuasion, and ultimately bogged down in an endless series of unrelated decisions.

Let us again turn to Congress for direction. The AID legislation clearly recognized this need for standards and priorities:

"Assistance," the law reads, "shall be based upon sound plans and programs; be directed toward the social as well as economic aspects of development, be responsive to the efforts of the recipient countries to mobilize their new resources and help themselves; be cognizant of the external and internal pressures which hamper their growth; and should emphasize long-range development assistance as the primary instrument of such growth."

Although the intent of this language seems evident, it is not an easy matter to transform it into the specific criteria necessary to guide our aid administrators.

It is not easy for two reasons: First every underdeveloped country is different from every other; and, second, the application of criteria drawn directly from the legislation is bound to antagonize the leaders of many countries which fail to meet these standards, and who are determined not to change their ways. Yet these two difficulties can and must be overcome.

Let us consider the initial problem of diversity.

Despite the wide variation among the developing countries, it is possible, I believe, to distinguish three major categories. These distinctions provide the basis for the criteria to which I refer.

In the first category of countries I would put the handful of nations which possess the preconditions for rapid economic and

social advance and which are effectively using their own resources.

These nations may be characterized in general terms by the following advantages:

(a) A reasonably competent government, able to maintain law and order;

(b) An equitable tax system based primarily on the ability to pay with a good record of collection;

(c) A well-conceived national economic development plan for the allocation of natural resources and foreign assistance;

(d) An effective program of widespread landownership;

(e) An integrated approach to community development that includes extension work, the use of volunteer leaders in school and road building;

(f) Reasonable incentives for private investment;

(g) Effective controls over their foreign exchange.

It is for the handful of developing nations that measure up to these high standards that this administration fought for the 5-year authority in the 1961 AID legislation, and the Congress provided it.

Several of them are now ready and able to move ahead increasingly on their own initiative toward self-sustaining development. Within the limits of our own resources, they deserve the highest priority in the programming of our development assistance. At the same time we should be cautious about lowering this priority standard because of short-term political pressures.

A second category lies at the other end of the spectrum. Here are the countries which are not yet qualified by skills or experience to absorb direct economic assistance even on a project basis.

Again congressional intent appears clear, for with regard to these countries, the development assistance act specified that "programs of development of education and human resources through such means as technical cooperation shall be emphasized, and the furnishing of capital facilities for purposes other than the development of education and human resources shall be given a lower priority until the requisite knowledge and skills have been developed."

This suggests that in such countries we should concentrate on technical assistance and education programs to help build an administrative and economic structure which will eventually enable these countries effectively to use development assistance funds.

The Peace Corps and various food-for-peace programs can carry a major share of the current load in countries in this category. This will enable us to demonstrate our concern for the people while their governments gain the experience to work out realistic plans and projects.

The remaining nations in the third category—those between the extremes of readiness for major investment on the one hand and total lack of such readiness on the other—will prove the most difficult for which to devise criteria.

Many ad hoc judgments will continue to be necessary. Yet realistic criteria for each of these nations may be based within reasonable limits on the degree to which they approach the standards for category No. 1.

Our objective should be to encourage their efforts toward balanced, integrated development with major emphasis on what happens to their people in the process of national growth and with due regard to their sense of community participation and individual dignity.

Additional funds can be allotted to those which improve their operations along these lines, thereby encouraging them toward the priority support category. Programs can be cut back where performance lags.

An examination of the experience in the United States with Federal grants-in-aid to

our States may be helpful in developing our operating guidelines.

The second obstacle to the enforcement of criteria for the distribution of our economic assistance is the resentment and resistance we will face from entrenched privileged groups in some recipient countries when we insist on a better performance.

If we act courageously in accordance with our congressional directives we shall be pressing many nations to undertake major reforms in long-established social and economic habits.

Land reform and tax reform, to cite two particularly important examples, are inevitably hot domestic political issues. For example, when we press other governments to adopt even the most basic reform programs we may undercut the political positions of government leaders who have regularly supported us in the United Nations in the hope that we will maintain a flow of dollars regardless of their reactionary and outmoded internal policies. This in turn may result in angry speeches attacking "Yankee interference in our country's affairs."

If we seriously intend to carry out the real purpose of the aid program such situations cannot be avoided. Yet the decision as to how hard we can press a government to carry out essential reforms at a more rapid pace involves a delicate political judgment which we must make on the merits of a specific case.

No doubt on some occasions overriding security or strategic considerations will force us to relax at least temporarily our pressures for reform. To cover such cases the law provides for aid through a special fund for "supporting assistance" or from the "emergency contingency fund."

Let us hope that expedient actions of this kind can be kept to a minimum, and that we clearly recognize the nature and probable duration of each expediency. By and large we are impelled by sheer commonsense and by clear-cut congressional mandates to support the basic institutional reforms which experience has taught us are necessary to economic progress and political stability.

We should never forget that expending aid without insisting on reforms is a kind of interference—interference on the side of the forces of the past rather than those of the future.

I can see no valid reason why American taxpayers should be taxed to help developing countries which lack the will or the vigor to help themselves.

The Bell report on the Philippines in 1951 provides an example of the affirmative, conditioned approach to the distribution of economic assistance to which I refer.

In this case United States assistance was strictly conditioned on steps being taken by the Philippine Government to carry out the recommendations outlined above, including the immediate enactment of tax legislation and other urgent reforms.

The recommendations outlined above included tax reforms, land distribution, a merit civil service, labor legislation, and a number of other specific and far-reaching steps.

Our insistence on these reforms encouraged the liberal reform elements in the Philippines to press for fundamental changes in the country's economic and social pattern. Thus, far from impeding growth and creating resentment against us, the United States espousal of these essential domestic reforms helped create the economic and political foundations on which subsequent forward-looking governments were elected to office.

4. In the task of nation building in Latin America, Asia, and Africa we must mobilize both our private and governmental resources.

Much of the strength of our free American society lies in its diversity. Our freedom is

rooted in the varied organizations and institutions which are represented at this meeting and in the enormous network of citizen activity which they foster.

In accordance with the congressional directive to encourage private participation in the aid program, AID and its predecessors have already done much to draw on the talents and enthusiasm of private organizations.

Yet we must learn how to make even greater use of these resources. Governments alone cannot produce the diversified societies we are seeking to encourage.

We are handicapping ourselves if we fail to enrich our aid program with the multitude of special skills and organizational know-how found among our citizen groups—not only those traditionally interested in "foreign affairs" but those whose horizons have tended to be limited to their immediate professional, cultural, or economic interests.

What is true of private American experience is also true of much governmental expertise not ordinarily tapped by an aid agency. State and local governments, for instance, can be drawn into associations with their counterparts overseas. Our Federal agencies in a dozen special fields need to become even more intimately involved in institution building abroad.

"Foreign aid" has a need for the talents of every section of American society. Let us involve those talents to the hilt.

5. We should boldly spell out to the peoples of the recipient countries and the world our traditional American faith in widespread landownership, in fair taxes based on the ability to pay, in broader educational opportunities and in human dignity and justice.

Our aid program will never work if the principles on which it is based are known only to the governmental officials with whom we deal abroad.

It is precisely the points which I have discussed today which require emphasis in our public presentations.

The purpose of this overseas information effort is not simply to glorify the United States. It is to make it crystal clear to every man, woman and child within reach of a radio or reading room that the nation of Jefferson and Lincoln still seeks a better life for all people everywhere, that we are still firmly committed to the economic and social reforms necessary to achieve this better life, and that the most lasting international partnerships are not among governments which are constantly changing but among people who alone are enduring.

Just as we Americans seek to mobilize all resources needed to meet the challenge, so must we call on the people and government in each developing nation to rally its own resources. And let us never forget that the most vital of these resources is an informed people, insisting on and dedicated to the all-out effort which alone can provide themselves and their children with the basis for a life of decency, justice, and domestic peace.

This brings us to a final element upon which the success or failure of our aid program will ultimately depend: the understanding and support of the American people.

In my opinion the Federal Government has a responsibility to tell the American people about the objectives, methods, accomplishments—and failures—of this crucially important effort.

The people of the United States have a right to know where their money is being spent, what it is being spent for, how well these programs are being administered, where and for what reasons Americans are working with peoples of other lands to help build free and independent societies.

If the people have this knowledge, if they understand the principles which Congress has laid down and the ways in which the

President and AID are carrying out Congress wishes then I am convinced they will give this program the support it deserves.

But the sad truth is that they have not been getting the facts they are entitled to. For years the public information unit of the foreign aid agency has been a deprived stepchild.

It has been wholly inadequate to provide more than a bare minimum of the news which all of us as citizens and taxpayers deserve to have.

To make the AID program understandable to the American people requires pamphlets and books and films and speakers and conferences like this one. In short, it requires an adequate domestic information program and a staff to run it.

I am confident that the new leadership of AID is aware of this need and is moving to provide the American people with the essential facts.

This leads me to my final point: only people can make development assistance meaningful.

Our task abroad is to release the energies of the people of the developing nations so that they can work effectively toward economic progress, increased justice, and a sense of individual fulfillment and participation.

Our task here at home is to bring the vast resources and democratic traditions of the American people to bear on the most important and constructive task of our era: the creation of a world of reason and of peace.

The Alliance for Progress in Latin America—and the alliance for progress throughout the world—is essentially an alliance of free people working for the goals for which we Americans have stood since the days of Jefferson.

In this spirit, let us get on with the job.

STEPHEN S. CHANG

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives relative to S. 1849.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1849) for the relief of Stephen S. Chang, which was, in line 6, strike out "October 2, 1954" and insert "the date of the enactment of this Act".

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President. On May 29, 1962, the Senate passed S. 1849, to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary as of the date of his first admission to the United States. In this connection, it was stated that the beneficiary, who is a research specialist employed by Boeing Airplane Co., could use his talents and training to better advantage if he had sufficient residence to enable him to petition for naturalization.

On August 7, 1962, the House of Representatives passed S. 1849, with an amendment to grant permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of the act. The amendment is acceptable.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 1849.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

ARIE ABRAMOVICH

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives relating to S. 2736.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2736) for the relief of Arie Abramovich, which were, in line 8, after "deportation" insert "solely"; in line 10, after "issued" insert "Provided, That nothing in this Act shall be construed to waive the provisions of section 315 of the Immigration and Nationality Act".

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on March 29, 1962, the Senate passed S. 2736, to provide for cancellation of outstanding deportation proceedings in behalf of the beneficiary.

On August 7, 1962, the House of Representatives passed S. 2736, with technical amendments which do not change the substance of the bill.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 2736.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

SIEU-YOEHS TSAI YANG

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives with reference to S. 2835.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2835) for the relief of Sieu-Yoeh Tsai Yang, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Sieu-Yoeh Tsai Yang. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Sieu-Yoeh Tsai Yang shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on July 3, 1962, the Senate passed S. 2835 to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary.

On August 7, 1962, the House of Representatives passed S. 2835 with an amendment to provide merely for cancellation of outstanding deportation proceedings.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 2835.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

BARTOLA MARIA S. LA MADRID

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate the messages from the House of Representatives regarding S. 3039.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House

of Representatives to the bill (S. 3039) for the relief of Bartola Maria S. La Madrid, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Bartola Maria S. La Madrid. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Bartola Maria S. La Madrid shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on July 3, 1962, the Senate passed S. 3039, to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary.

On August 7, 1962, the House of Representatives passed S. 3039 with an amendment to provide merely for cancellation of outstanding deportation proceedings.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 3039.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to.

INCREASES IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I am pleased to note that there is pending on the Senate Calendar H.R. 10743, the bill already passed by the House to increase the rates of compensation for veterans who have incurred service-connected disabilities.

I very much hope that it will be called up as quickly as possible and passed for the President's signature. The Nation should not—and I am sure does not—begrudge to its injured veterans this very much needed but quite conservative adjustment so that these veterans may be better able to cope with the rising cost of living.

This bill simply calls for additional compensation to take care of the great changes in the cost of living since the rates were last adjusted in 1957. It would also increase compensation for the more seriously disabled veterans. For example, an American war veteran, totally disabled and permanently housebound as a result of service wounds, now receives \$265 a month. The pending bill would increase this amount by \$25 to \$290. According to the Senate Finance Committee, the total cost of increases would be approximately \$98 million in the first year.

This reasonable measure is strongly supported by the Veterans' Administration and the Disabled American Veterans.

Yesterday I had the great privilege of making a speech before the opening session of the convention of the Disabled American Veterans. There is no group in American to who we are more grateful—and quite properly so—than the Disabled American Veterans.

Madam President, I know of the deep feelings the American people and the Senators have for the disabled veter-

ans—the blind, those who have lost their limbs, those who have suffered grievous wounds in defense of this Nation—and I express the deep hope that we may in this session, before we go home, yet pass this very critically important bill. I shall do everything I can to bring that about.

Madam President, the bill deserves to be on anybody's "must" list—the President's, the Congress', and that of each of us. I hope very much it will have our early attention.

Madam President, I think my time has been consumed, so I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DANGER IN BERLIN

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, as I said in my speech yesterday, every American will be deeply disquieted by the news in the press about West Berlin and the riots at the wall, as headlined in the New York newspapers, and, I am sure, as headlined all over the country.

What has occurred represents a very tough problem and calls for great discipline on the part of the people of West Berlin and great understanding on our part. The provocation is absolutely intolerable. We understand that. Provocations, though dramatized by the beastly and inhuman shooting down of the young East German who was trying to escape to freedom across the awful Berlin wall, have nonetheless been occurring for months. Indeed, the first anniversary of the wall was the occasion for the demonstrations. But the people of West Berlin have been through the airlift in 1948 and 1949. At that time they showed great discipline and heroism when they were suffering en masse, and not alone in the particularized and very dramatic way which is epitomized by the wall and the separation of friends from friends and of families from families.

Our problem is that we cannot allow the policy of the United States, which might bring us to the always-present danger of war through a conflict of force in Berlin, to be made on the streets of Berlin. Therefore, I express the expectation that the subject will be dealt with on the highest level.

I was very much disquieted to note in yesterday's press the failure of the mayor of Berlin, the heroic and outstanding Willy Brandt, to caution his own people as to the implications of such acts in terms of driving the Western powers, which are in Berlin at such great risk and under such great responsibility, into some kind of difficult position with respect to the question of conflict in Berlin, and to urge the people of Berlin rather to stay their hands and restrain themselves, as horrible as the provocations are.

I hope very much that in the days ahead our President and the State Department will make our position crystal clear to Chancellor Adenauer and other German leaders, so that Chancellor

Adenauer may communicate it to others. Though we completely understand the problems which are erupting with such indignation and even violence on the streets of Berlin, yet we cannot allow American or allied policy to be governed by that kind of situation, because the result might be contrary to what the provocations so justly deserve.

So I express the hope and expectation which we have already expressed, that there will be an understanding, in terms of the conduct of the people of West Berlin themselves, who have so much at stake, that, having given vent to their feelings so unmistakably, there now may be some sense of discipline in the situation, which would be far more conducive to ultimate success in the very thing they seek than pushing the allies into a corner from which they might take a route which would be very disagreeable to the maintenance of freedom in Berlin.

Let us remember that the Vice President has properly, and in the name of all American people, pledged our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor to the defense of freedom in Berlin. Let us take it very seriously, as we must, but let the people of West Berlin themselves take it equally seriously.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask the Senator to yield only to say that, as one Senator, I am very grateful to the Senator from New York in respect to the particular issue on which he has spoken, not only now but in the past. The people of West Berlin have lived under constant tension and have faced hundreds of provocations that would test the emotional stability of the greatest and strongest of any people. Nevertheless, the policy of our Nation, which has the major responsibility in West Berlin for the freedom and security of that area, must be governed by our commitments to our NATO allies, our commitments to the people of West Berlin, and our requirements of national security. That means that while large numbers of citizens in West Berlin may storm the gates, so to speak, and beat their fists against the wall, it is the duty of officials in this country and those who are responsible for the conduct of our troops and our other personnel in West Berlin to take a responsible, objective, and careful attitude at all times, and judge our policy on the basis of what the requirements are for the freedom of Berlin rather than the immediate emotional issue.

The Senator from New York has stated the situation very well. My heart goes out to those fine, good people. As one human being, I was as distressed as anyone could be over the tragic circumstances which developed in the past few days, such as the shooting of the young man who sought freedom by escaping from East Germany into West Berlin. Nevertheless, it is my view that our Government must proceed with caution, and yet firmness, with sympathy, and yet due deliberation at all times, lest we

precipitate some thoughtless or emotional act and major crisis.

The Senator has emphasized that point very well. I commend him for it. The easy way is to shake one's fist, to raise one's voice, and say, "Let us attack."

But the right way, it seems to me, is to stand guard, calmly, courageously, and perseveringly, to make sure that West Berlin remains a bastion of freedom, as we have pledged it to be. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator for his graciousness and, more importantly, for his confirmation of my view as to the policy of our country. There is a line between an indignant protest and a riot. That is the line which it is critically important that we keep clearly in mind, because the alternatives are extremely dangerous, both for our responsibilities and for the German people themselves. I express the deep feeling that after we have shown what we have in terms of our devotion to our commitments in West Germany, it would certainly be the path of constructive statesmanship to make us capable of keeping our commitments rather than to endeavor to impose policy on the streets of Berlin. I thank my colleague for his observations.

HERE'S HAWAII—OUR 50TH STATE

Mr. FONG. Madam President, 60 years after the Hawaiian Islands were annexed to the United States of America, the people of the 49 States, through their representatives in the Congress, answered Hawaii's call for admission to the Union. On August 21, 1959, 3 years ago today, the Islands of Hawaii became our 50th State, her citizens at long last full-fledged citizens of the oldest Republic in the world.

This third anniversary of statehood offers another opportunity to express "mahalo"—the Hawaiian word meaning "thanks"—to the citizens of our sister States for their faith and confidence in these mid-Pacific island people. Though we are separated by a 2,500-mile expanse of ocean, we are united with mainland Americans by the same magic ingredient that binds Americans from coast to coast and from border to border: That exalted concept as stated in our Declaration of Independence and affirmed in our Constitution that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among them life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

By all the experience of ages past, America should long ago have perished from dissension and internal strife. No other nation embraces within its boundaries the great heterogeneity of nationality groups, racial groups, religious groups, labor groups, social groups, professional groups—all manner of groups—which exist in America.

But in America we have discovered a way of working together that surmounts our differences, and we find in that very variety enrichment and spice for our lives.

Nowhere in our vast Nation has this harmony been more evident than in Hawaii.

When the word "Hawaii" is mentioned, customarily unfolds a mental image of blue skies, rolling surf, white beaches, swaying palm trees, thatched huts, and lovely hula maidens dancing on the shore while tawny-skinned natives watch—all in all, a portrait of a relatively primitive society.

Hawaii today still possesses blue skies, rolling surf, white beaches, swaying palm trees and, thank goodness, hula maidens. Our climate, too, remains delightful, averaging 78° in summer and 72° in winter, and the trade winds still caress our islands.

But our community is no longer primitive but very modern and progressive. Multistory apartments, hotels, and solid homes have long since replaced the thatched huts, and a multiracial people now reside in the once exclusively Polynesian paradise. Hawaii's profile has indeed changed.

Today, more than 630,000 civilians, augmented by nearly 60,000 military personnel call Hawaii home. Actually, Hawaii is a community composed of immigrants. Even the so-called native Hawaiians are descendants of adventurous Polynesians, those skillful mariners who, it is believed, sailed the vast Pacific from Malaysia in single and double canoes. Centuries later explorers and sailors from the chief maritime powers of the world made Hawaii a port of call, and successive waves of immigrants flooded Hawaii's shores.

So that today, some 202,000 persons, or 32 percent, are of Caucasian ancestry; 203,000, or 32.2 percent, of Japanese ancestry; 69,000, or 10.9 percent, of Filipino ancestry; 38,000, or 6 percent, of Chinese ancestry; and some 119,000, or 18.9 percent, of all other ancestries, according to the U.S. census of 1960. Included in the category of "all other" are 9,000 full-blooded Hawaiians and more than 100,000 part Hawaiians.

The people of Hawaii are a relatively young people. Surprisingly, statehood has had little effect on population growth in our islands, and our median age remains 24.

Hawaii has a fine public school system and notable private schools as well. This year 9,600 students graduated from our high schools, compared with only 5,200 10 years ago. Nearly two-thirds of Hawaii's graduates this year plan to attend college or other training schools.

We are a religious people. There are more than 400 Protestant churches, 115 Catholic churches, and more than 100 Buddhist temples in the State of Hawaii.

Topographically, Hawaii is most diverse, boasting such varied attractions as deserts and swamps, mountains and seashore, sun and snow, lush valleys, and barren lava flows, and some of the most spectacular scenery in the world.

Our geographic location, once a negative factor in Hawaii's economic development, has now become an important growth factor. It has made Hawaii a world travel center, the operational center for America's defense system throughout the Pacific, and the only cen-

tral Pacific port for the rapidly growing volume of shipping and air transportation.

So that today, as our State Department of Economic Development recently pointed out, health, wealth, and happiness increased in the past fiscal year.

As to health, no cases of typhoid, diphtheria, or whooping cough were reported. The tuberculosis death rate was down to 2.2 per 100,000 population.

As to wealth, Hawaii ranks above the national average in per capita income, in growth of personal income, in percentage of labor force employed, in construction in ratio to population, in growth of bank clearings, in per capita automobile ownership, and many other factors that indicate economic well-being.

According to one consumer analysis, approximately 96 percent of the households in Honolulu have a radio; 91 percent have one or more television sets; 68 percent have an automatic washer; and 22 percent a food freezer.

As for happiness, marriages were up to 8.8 per 1,000 population.

Agriculture remains Hawaii's leading industry by far, with sugar, king, earning \$145 million last year and pineapple, queen, at \$117 million. Other agriculture produced \$43½ million in 1961, including dairy milk at a value of \$10.4 million; beef cattle, \$9.7 million; eggs, \$7.1 million; vegetables, \$5.8 million; hogs, \$3.7 million; coffee, \$3.2 million; poultry meat, \$2.1 million; and fruits, \$1.6 million.

Our second leading industry, tourism, produced \$137 million in 1961, and, we are hopeful, will reach \$156 million this year.

Federal spending for military purposes exceeded the \$400 million mark in 1961, as Hawaii continued to play its crucial role as the hub of our Nation's Pacific defense and our first line of defense in that far-reaching and important ocean.

Manufacturing in 1961 had a total value of \$168.6 million, while the value of construction was \$268.5 million. Hawaii's exports in 1961 reached \$281 million as against imports of \$573 million. Retail sales totaled \$362.5 million, while wholesale sales were \$354 million.

Motor car registrations for 1961 were 249,400, while telephones in use totaled 221,600. On our most populous island, Oahu, 1.5 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity were sold.

In 1961, average annual unemployment ran at 4.1 percent, versus 6.7 percent for the entire United States. Personal income was up 5 percent, versus the Federal average of 3.6 percent. Population was up 5.6 percent; diversified manufacturing jumped nearly 16 percent; defense spending advanced 8 percent; bank clearings were 14 percent above 1960; and 49,000 telephones were put into use. Sugar income rose \$19.3 million in 1961, although pineapple declined \$3.2 million. Visitors spent 6 million additional dollars in Hawaii. Construction fell off 2.5 percent, as it leveled off from its boom strength.

Hawaii's economic outlook for the future continues bright. There are many yet unpublicized projects and

plans in the mill which will augment known expansion and growth plans. Our mood, I should say, is increasingly realistic and confident.

Meantime, since statehood, Hawaii finds our Nation is increasingly relying upon us to assist in national and international programs. Hawaii's missile tracking station participated in the space orbital flights of our astronauts in addition to performing valuable service in connection with high altitude and space research. Hawaii's excellent shipyard at Pearl Harbor was selected to service and repair some of our newest underwater weapons, the Polaris submarines.

Hawaii was selected as the site for the East-West Center created by Congress in 1960. This is an institution where Asian and American students and scholars may study and learn not only about their field of interest, but about each other, so that occidental and oriental may draw nearer in mutual understanding and respect.

Construction began last year on the East-West Center complex of buildings, of which the women's dormitory and transient quarters are due for completion in September; the administration and food service building, the theater-auditorium, and Gateway House, for completion in November; the men's high-rise dormitory, in January; and a classroom-laboratory building, next July.

Hawaii also was selected as a training site for Peace Corps members destined for assignment in Asia and the Far East.

More and more as a State, Hawaii is fulfilling its manifest destiny: To build a bridge between mainland United States and the vast area of Asia and the Pacific wherein reside more than one-half of the world's population. It is a big task, for few of these people know or understand America.

As the Pacific showcase of America's economic and political democracy and living evidence of America's brotherhood with all peoples, Hawaii since statehood is full partner with her 49 sister States in our Nation's overriding struggle to fashion a world recognizing the inherent dignity and equality of man.

On this third anniversary of statehood, Hawaii reaffirms its adherence to fundamental American policy, so eloquently expressed by the eminent Judge Learned Hand:

Right knows no boundaries and justice no frontier; the brotherhood of man is not a domestic institution. We may not stop until we have done our part to fashion a world in which there shall be some share of fellowship.

NEWS CONFERENCE ON SOVIET SPACE FEATS

Mr. WILEY. Madam President, the Nation, following the Russian space dual-orbiting of spacecraft, is reexamining the significance of this feat, both militarily and scientifically.

Recently, NASA officials discussed the significance of Soviet progress in a news conference. The participants included: James E. Webb, Administrator, Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator, Dr.

Robert C. Seamans, Jr., Associate Administrator, D. Brainerd Holmes, Director, Office of Manned Space Flight, and O. B. Lloyd, Jr., Director, Office of Public Services and Information.

The conference, I believe, deserves the attention of Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news release relating to the conference.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWS CONFERENCE ON RUSSIAN SPACE SHOT

(Participants: Mr. James E. Webb, Administrator, NASA; Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator, NASA; Dr. Robert C. Seamans, Jr., Associate Administrator, NASA; Mr. D. Brainerd Holmes, Director, Office of Manned Space Flight, NASA; and Mr. O. B. Lloyd, Jr., Director, Office of Public Services and Information, NASA.)

Mr. Webb. Ladies and gentlemen, we understand that quite a number of you have questions that you would like to ask those of us in the Space Administration who have been concerned with the manned space program. I thought Mr. Brainerd Holmes would be here. We are trying to find out whether he got delayed somewhere on the way.

As I am sure all of you know, we have here Dr. Hugh Dryden, Deputy Administrator, and Dr. Robert Seamans, Associate Administrator here.

If you have questions, let us have them. If they are for Mr. Holmes, we will expect him in just a few moments.

Question. Mr. Webb, first question: Do you think that the Russians hoped actually to link up these two ships in a completion of the actual rendezvous technique?

Mr. Webb. The detailed review of the Russian flights has been made by Dr. Dryden more completely than it has by either Dr. Seamans or myself. I think that you would have a better answer from him, if that is satisfactory to you.

Here is Mr. Holmes now.

Dr. DRYDEN. The answer is very simple. I can't read the Russian mind any more than you can. I just don't know.

Question. Mr. Webb, sir, Bernard Lovell in England said this morning that on the basis of this double orbit, by Russia so far, he doubted whether America could catch up within a decade. Do you have any comment?

Mr. Webb. You will have to evaluate Dr. Lovell's statement for yourself. I differ with him. I think the key—and again you will have to bear in mind that as an administrator I am not weighing the details of the technical problems involved—looking at the buildup of some of the bigger programs of the United States, with which I have been involved, from the first Greek/Turkish aid program, on through the military assistance program which, I would like to remind you, was a billion and a half dollars the first year, I would say that we have underway a large, ongoing, fast-paced program.

One of the essential elements of President Kennedy's decision a year ago was to build big boosters. In the intervening time we have put under contract to mobilize the resources not only of the Government but of a large number of American companies, the various stages of the big boosters required to give us great capacity in space.

This work is going forward. It will produce results in this decade that I believe will put the United States in a satisfactory position in space.

Question. Mr. Holmes, I would like to ask you if you were surprised by this twin flight, and do you feel it means that the Russians can beat us to the moon now?

Mr. HOLMES. I can't hear the question.

Question. The question is, Was Mr. Holmes surprised by the Soviet flight, and does he feel it means they can beat us to the moon?

Mr. HOLMES. No, I wasn't surprised. I certainly didn't expect the exact thing that they did. On the other hand, if one analyzes what they did, I think we would be selling the Russians pretty short if we didn't feel that a year after they launched a Vostok on a booster that could lift that kind of a weight, something of the order of 10,000 pounds, that they couldn't indeed perform in this fashion.

I think a much more significant way to look at this when people say they are ahead of us and does this mean they are so many years ahead, is that we are working in a development program where the work that one does today doesn't reach fruition for several years, and the work they have done today or in the last few days is work that they had been doing over the past years. I don't think it has any particular significance on our race to the moon.

Question. Is there any evidence that they used a bigger booster to do this job with?

Dr. DRYDEN. The answer is "No." May I supplement this with just one statement?

So many people think that going to the moon is going down a one-way street, passing successive street corners. It is very far from that. It is the mobilization of a large task force with a lot of jobs to be done and brought to fruition simultaneously. It doesn't make much difference in which order you do them. The fact that the Russians have done one part of this job a little ahead of us does not mean that they are ahead on the whole enterprise of going to the moon.

Mr. Webb. I would like to go back just one moment to this question of what the Russians may have intended.

I think it is important to recognize that their capability is one thing. What they may intend to do is another. It is very difficult to judge from the evidence precisely what they might intend. I think all of you know that most of the announcements that they have made about actual accomplishments in space have been borne out by the weight of evidence; and we have so announced, as officials of this Government from time to time.

I don't believe they have announced that they intended to join the spacecraft.

Question. Mr. Webb, along that same line, if I may: Has our tracking system confirmed the Soviet version of the flight of the two cosmonauts?

Mr. Webb. Again I would like to refer that to Dr. Dryden.

Dr. DRYDEN. I think I would say that I don't think that we should discuss how much or how little we confirm. I will simply make the statement that the knowledge available to us does confirm that they launched the two ships, as they said; that they were launched within a very short time of each other; that they made what Chairman Khrushchev described as a group flight, and I call your attention to his choice of words. I am convinced myself that if they had made anything like a rendezvous that they would announce it immediately.

Question. Dr. Dryden, are you saying that they fired a couple of men—

Mr. Webb. Wait a minute.

There are two questions. Can we let Dr. Seamans have a quick comment there?

Dr. SEAMANS. I would add to what Dr. Dryden said. He didn't mean that they both left terra firma at exactly the same time, but rather that the second spacecraft was launched very close to the intended time, so that it would end up in orbit close to the first spacecraft.

Question. Sir, are you saying, then, that what they did was launch a couple of manned cannonballs into space on very close orbit, but that apparently they did not try

to adjust the orbits once in space with on-board propulsion?

Dr. DRYDEN. I do not know whether they adjusted the orbits or not.

Question. Why can we not get American tracking data on that? Apparently the Russians know what they did. Why shouldn't the American people find out what they did?

Dr. DRYDEN. I think your question is a good one. I think I have given you the information which is solid. They have done what they said they did. I do not know whether they did anything more than this at the present time.

Question. Dr. Dryden, what do you think was their intent? What do you think they meant by "group flight"?

Dr. DRYDEN. Group flight means two things flying together, like two airplanes in group formation.

Question. Is there any advantage in sending two men up in—

Dr. DRYDEN. The stated objective of the Russians, as I understand it, was to subject two men to identical space exposures, and weightlessness, to see whether there was any effect on the particular individual. This was announced, I believe, in the news from Moscow as the primary purpose of the flight, plus the obvious one of longer duration, which is needed to do this.

Question. Dr. Dryden, we know we have a radar tracking network—

Mr. Webb. We had a question from the back ahead of you, please.

Question. In other words, do you fear, Dr. Dryden, there might be military implications?

Dr. DRYDEN. No, any more than there is military implications in any activity in space. I think the Russians did a thoroughly professional job in the launching of these two satellites.

Mr. Webb. Certainly this technology is a base for military potential. The real question, I think, is at what time and in what manner will a decision be reached with respect to specific military missions and operations. I think this basically is the question.

This technology, just as our own technology, is the foundation for many things. The question of whether this particular flight would have military significance I would think ought to be answered by the military people perhaps more than by us. We regard it as a demonstration of very real technical capacity.

Would you want to add anything to that, Bob?

Dr. SEAMANS. No, I think it is well stated.

Question. Mr. Webb, in connection with your answer before, just to clarify this, you were asked whether you thought we would be ahead of the Russians, and you said you thought in the next decade we would be in a satisfactory position. Could you answer specifically whether you think in the next decade we will be ahead of the Russians?

Mr. Webb. I think what I was asked is whether I agreed with another statement saying that we couldn't possibly catch up in the next 10 years.

I think you must think of these programs, if you are thinking at the policy level, of the resources to be invested, of the reaction you may have to any one of these street corners that you pass going down the street, as Dr. Dryden has characterized it.

My own belief is that the bringing to bear through the resources that the Government is applying, the utilization of those resources to mobilize industry will give us a position satisfactory to the United States. Whether you say we will be ahead with respect to some specific kind of an event, I think we will make the manned lunar landing and return before they do.

Question. Mr. Webb, I don't know whether I should direct this to you or Dr. Dryden.

There have been varying reports, none from Russia of course, about the size and weight of the two latest spacecraft. One Danish newspaper today, a Communist newspaper, said it was $8\frac{1}{2}$ tons.

Do you have any information as to whether the two latest spacecraft were actually larger and heavier than the previous ones of Gagarin and Titov?

Mr. WEBB. I believe Dr. Dryden answered that before.

Dr. DRYDEN. We have no definite information. As you know, the former Vostok was 10,000 pounds. We know that the same booster has put 14,000 pounds in orbit in the Venus shot.

Question. Does the fact that they were exercising and moving around in the cabin indicate it was a larger cabin?

Dr. DRYDEN. The television pictures I saw didn't indicate any possibility of moving around. They could stir in the chair and lean over, but I did not see any evidence that they could move around in the sense of walking around.

Question. Dr. Dryden, were there any indications that any forces other than natural decays through atmospheric drag were operating on these two Russian satellites from the moment they were injected until the moment they came back? Did they have on-board rocket propulsion?

Dr. DRYDEN. I do not know, from anything that I have seen.

Question. I would like to ask Dr. Holmes if he sees in the tracking data from the Soviet flight any tipoff to the techniques they are going to use for a lunar voyage; and if he does, whether or not it gives him any doubts about our program.

Mr. HOLMES. No, on all counts.

Mr. WEBB. You see, you can't read the outline of a broad program from one event in the program. One of the Russian cosmonauts stated, as reported in the press, that this was like the first steps of a baby. You can't tell which baby will win the race in the track meet at age 16 or 18 from the first steps taken. This is their own characterization. It is not a bad one.

Dr. DRYDEN. I think if you just look at the record, it has been a little over a year since any manned activity by the Russians until this present flight.

Question. Dr. Dryden, could you tell us the significance of that last statement? What is the significance of that?

Dr. DRYDEN. Well, it has not been a vigorously pushed activity program. There have been no flights since about a year ago.

Question. Is there any indication they had failures, attempted flights?

Dr. DRYDEN. I know of none.

Question. Dr. Dryden, can we just clear up the other point of Dr. Lovell's comment, which was that from a technological viewpoint he thought that the Russians could now knock down or remove any American satellite at a moment in orbit.

Dr. DRYDEN. I think there are easier ways than this of doing that.

Question. What does that mean?

Dr. DRYDEN. Well, if you decided you wanted to knock down satellites, I don't think you would do it by sending up a manned satellite at the moment.

Question. Dr. Dryden, if they tried to go to the moon by putting together a dozen or so Vostoks, how long do you think it would take them?

Dr. DRYDEN. I don't know. Your estimate is about the same as mine. If you use the figures of 10,000 and 14,000 pounds, it would take at least 7 to 10 loads put together to go to the moon.

Question. NASA rejected this approach of multiple rendezvous. Why did NASA reject that approach if it is feasible, or is it feasible at all?

Dr. SEAMANS. It represents a very difficult problem to take up exactly the right elements

so that they will all nicely fit together and can be nicely checked out in orbit before going to the moon.

Dr. DRYDEN. I think some of you asked about the significance from a rendezvous point of view. This attempt, if it was an attempt, represents the simplest case where you launch both vehicles from the same launch region, with the same facilities and the same orbital plane.

It is a little bit more difficult problem to change orbital plane and to rendezvous with an object which is not in the same orbital plane. In other words, this is the first step; assuming that it is the first step in rendezvous, there is still a lot more to be done before rendezvous is accomplished.

Question. Is there any possibility of rendezvousing outside of a different plane than the one originally projected? If so, about how many degrees out of phase could it rendezvous?

Dr. DRYDEN. I don't know. These two orbits, as you know, were within 2 minutes of the same inclination, and differing only a few miles in the orbital elements.

Question. Couldn't there be a takeoff for the moon from such an orbit?

Dr. DRYDEN. Not manned. It takes a weight, as my friend out here estimated, he said 12 times—I said 7 to 10 times—the load of one of these boosters.

Question. Dr. Seamans, or Dr. Holmes, I wonder if you would comment on the accuracy of the guidance involved, and also the ability, the apparent ability of the Russians to do this on the first crack. Is this by any means a criticism of our own program?

Dr. SEAMANS. My understanding is that as far as guidance accuracy is concerned, what they achieved is roughly comparable to what we achieve in our Mercury flights. To me the significant element here is that on the second flight they were able to take off within a limited period of time.

As you all know who have covered these flights, countdowns can be protracted for one reason or another.

Dr. DRYDEN. You might spell that out in a little more detail. If you look at the orbital elements of the Glenn flight and the Carpenter flight, they are within the limits shown by these two spacecraft, although they were launched at different times.

Question. Mr. Webb, you mentioned a few minutes ago about the resources we are devoting to our program. Do you think we are devoting enough resources if, as you say, we are going to beat the Russians to the moon?

Mr. WEBB. This is a very difficult question. The Government is a representative government. The programs of the Government were outlined by the President in his budget, recommended by him to the Congress, then passed on by the Congress. The President has weighed the requirements of this program as against all others in the Government. He has made his recommendations. The Congress has in a bipartisan way almost unanimously approved those recommendations.

Under the first recommendations made last year, which stepped the program up to about \$1.7 billion, and did include a driving effort to build big boosters and a family of manned spacecraft, we made tremendous progress over the past year.

We have gotten the Mercury moving toward a 1-day mission, we have got the Gemini under contract with the boosters to fly it, we have the Saturn program advanced rapidly, looking to an advanced Saturn with all of the units of the advanced Saturn already under contract. These are very large accomplishments in that period of time.

It is this kind of trend that I think indicates the power that this Nation's space program will show. Whether or not this kind of doubling each year is enough, I would say that it is going to answer the needs of this Nation if the present buildup proceeds.

On the other hand, there are other very great needs of the Nation and this Nation will have to consider, very carefully, how it utilizes space. At the present moment the policy of the Government is to operate for a peaceful benefit-of-mankind program to the maximum extent possible. It has a military program, but it is not in the mainstream of this activity, technological development in an open way. Whether you would have to convert over toward this kind of a major emphasis on military programs is a decision that will have to come with time, depending on all of the elements.

If such a thing should have to take place, undoubtedly greater resources I think would go into the program.

But right now we are going to build a 7.5-million-pound Saturn as rapidly as the industrial might of the United States can build it, without going in parallel courses of development. We might even have to decide to overcome some obstacles with parallel courses, as was done in the Manhattan project. But I think a very real step-up in the resources available has been made by this administration and is having its effect.

Question. Mr. Webb, some of our top Air Force officials, General LeMay, for one, have expressed themselves many times in recent months saying we are not doing enough militarily in space. Is there anything in these flights which would lead you to believe that he has a point?

Mr. WEBB. The way you phrase your question, you are asking me to agree or disagree with General LeMay, who is Chief of Staff of the Air Force. I don't really think I want to do that. I have stated that the program as outlined by the President, as endorsed by the Congress and with funds provided by the Congress to carry it out, is mainly to develop the base of research, science, technology that gives us the capacity to utilize that power either militarily or for other purposes. The policy is to try to utilize it for these other purposes as long as possible.

I can understand the concern of military men about this. I believe, as one administrator in this Government, that we do have a balanced way to consider these items.

Question. Mr. Webb, if it were your decision, if you wanted to do it, could you take over another pad if the range people down there made it available to you, and lob two men in two spacecrafts into similar orbits for a 24-hour period.

Mr. WEBB. Within what time period? It takes a good deal of time to convert a launch pad from previous use to one of this kind.

Question. I mean if a pad were available to you, a second pad, other than 14, could you duplicate what the Russians did, at least insofar as putting two men in two spacecrafts into a similar orbit pattern?

Mr. WEBB. I think it is doubtful if the Atlas were the vehicle to be used.

Question. Is a further speedup in our program possible, and have you four gentlemen discussed such a speedup since this flight?

Mr. WEBB. The answer is "Yes, a speedup in the program is possible." The program, as I have said to the Senate Appropriation Committee last Friday, when requesting the restoration of the funds that were eliminated by the House, I said this is a fast-paced program. It is not a crash program or an all-automatic program. I think that is the way you would characterize it.

If you want to convert from a very fast paced program that is utilizing the state of the art as it develops as rapidly as you can do without an all-out or crash program, that is what we now have.

If you want to convert it, we have the capacity. We built an organization of able men. We have tremendous resources working with us on this program. They could do more.

Question. Have you gentlemen discussed that?

Mr. WEBB. Yes, we have discussed the problems, the review of this program. We are continuously discussing this kind of a question here. We are in very close touch with the Defense Department. Mr. McNamara was over here for lunch a few weeks ago. We go over there. We meet once a month for a pretty thorough discussion.

We are reviewing—it is no secret from you gentlemen—he and I and the Budget Director are giving very active consideration to the total space program looking toward the 1964 budget.

I would not want to leave the impression that we would recommend to the President or that he will send to the Congress a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1963. I doubt that that will take place.

But again I cannot speak for the President in that regard. Governments may come that would indicate that. But I do think that in connection with the continuation of the present drive of our ongoing program, you could spend money faster if you wanted to convert it into a program. But this would result in rather large budget figures here and in the Defense Department.

Question. How large, sir?

Mr. WEBB. I don't want to try predicting an exact amount, especially where military programs are concerned.

You know that this year our program, as recommended by the President, was about \$3.9 billion, including a supplemental request. The military figures were announced to be about \$1.5 billion. You add those together and you are between \$5.5 and \$6 billion for this year for both programs.

If you wanted to convert this to what you might call an all-out program in connection with NASA, you would go beyond, say, \$5 to \$5.5 billion a year. You might go beyond \$6 billion a year for this organization.

Question. Could you give us an idea of some of the things you might do if you were to move from a fast-pace to a crash-basis program?

Mr. WEBB. I think I should leave it to these gentlemen. I will start the discussion by saying that I think we would look at hydrogen technology on which our upper stages are all based. We might start some parallel developments in this area of hydrogen technology. If we had an upper stage to put on our present Saturn C-1 today, we could do a great deal. This would give us a weight-lifting capacity greater than that that has been demonstrated by the Russians up to now.

Maybe other gentlemen here might want to comment on that.

There are probably other things we would do in the scientific exploration to accumulate the knowledge that would permit us to generate real power in space. We have a good program there and it is ongoing. But in the development of the hardware and the technology, we might invest more resources if we want to try to get boost capacity somewhat faster.

Question. When do you expect the Advanced Saturn, and how much time would you gain if you had a crash program?

Mr. WEBB. Just a minute. We haven't quite answered that question unless you are satisfied with that answer.

Mr. HOLMES. I was satisfied with it. I think it would be unrealistic not to say that an all-out crash program, where national survival, where funds you say were unlimited or secondary, that certainly in parallel developments, you would work less efficiently by working people more overtime. You would do all this kind of thing which I don't believe leads to a better program. But if it were that kind of a crash effort that is what you would do and that is where you would spend your money.

Mr. WEBB. We will learn a vast amount from the Gemini program not only about extended weightlessness with our men but

also with respect to the rendezvous technique. We will be working in intimate association with the military services who will launch the Atlas and the Agena with which our craft will rendezvous.

The Gemini is now on a two-shift basis. Would you put it on a 2½-shift basis? Actually, when you are doing this advanced technology, it is not easy to transfer the particular job from a man who has worked 8 hours during the day to a man who is going to work 8 hours during the night and then make another transfer to pick up the same job to do on the third shift. These are the kinds of questions you have to consider.

You can get more done. It will be done inefficiently. We believe we have a program that marries all of the considerations in an effective way, and is going to give results that the American people will be proud of.

Question. When do you expect to have the Advanced Saturn C, and when could you get it if you had a crash program?

Mr. WEBB. Bob, do you want to answer the first part of that?

Dr. SEAMANS. 1965, the first part. I don't know what Brainerd thinks he could do if he had unlimited resources.

Mr. HOLMES. 1965 is surely correct.

If you can tell me how much unlimited resources and what the ground rules are, I could give you a new date. I wouldn't hazard it this way.

Question. The only ground rules are in the context of what we are talking about now, what Mr. Webb referred to as a crash program?

Mr. WEBB. Would you give it a higher priority than some of our military programs? This is the kind of question you would have to answer in that regard. Undoubtedly some of the resources required to advance these big boosters would cut into the effort now going into military programs and I would like to say, as a matter of policy, wherever there has been a question of a military program utilizing resources, we have always taken the position in this agency and in the Government that that comes ahead of our work in the industrial placing of contracts.

Question. Let me settle it for you. If the premise were set that it was militarily important to get to the moon in a hurry, and therefore you did get some of that money, how much time could you save if you had a crash program?

Mr. WEBB. It isn't money. It is a question of changing men from work on missiles and warheads into building big boosters. That is the kind of question.

Dr. SEAMANS. I think it ought to be clear that the Advanced Saturn is being developed in a very aggressive fashion. It does have a DX priority. I am sure that you can always save a few months of time, but no matter how much effort on it, you are not going to save very much time.

Question. In other words, even with a crash program—

Dr. SEAMANS. What you are really doing is providing greater assurance of meeting a particular target date, rather than of guaranteeing that you are going to speed it up.

Mr. HOLMES. Optimistically, it will be 6 months to a year. It is that sort of thing.

Question. The best you can do with a crash program is 6 months to a year?

Mr. HOLMES. On the Advanced Saturn.

Mr. WEBB. I think you must bear in mind that this program now, and the manpower going into it, is doubling every year and has done so for the last several years. It will double again with the money now being appropriated by the Congress. The question is, do you want to do more than double every year? This is a great national decision.

Question. Mr. Webb, you say that we are going to land a man on the moon before the Russians. Mr. Holmes said that the

two men just sent up didn't have any significance in the moon race. But in the past few days a lot of people, scientists and laymen, have taken the opposite view, that the Russians are pulling ahead rather than our catching up, and they don't see any event, any program that will be a point when we will catch and overtake the Russians.

Mr. WEBB. First I said that my opinion is that we will meet the date set by President Kennedy of making the landing in this decade, and I think we will do it, considering all of the resources we are putting into it in advance of the Russians. That is really what I said.

The second, I don't think Mr. Holmes said there was no significance in connection with the lunar program of the flights made by the Russians. These, as I stated earlier, are demonstrations of a very real technological capacity, an ability to plan and engineer and build and fly vehicles that can carry men for extended periods of time. They have this significance of advancing one more step of the first, you might almost say, steps of an infant out into space, the infant human race. They do have significance. So I wouldn't say they have no significance.

The people who have been making statements that this has more significance than we believe it has have to speak for themselves. You have to judge them on the basis of their knowledge. We are responsible Government officials here giving you the best we can as to what the situation really is.

Question. What point in the program, or what accomplishment do you see the United States able to do before the Russians are able to do it? What year will that be in?

Mr. WEBB. Let me add one point to the previous statement.

You see, in this country we have had a tendency for a great many people over a period of years who felt we ought to have a program to rush out with a great many statements about the need for a program and where we stand and catastrophic events that would come if no program were developed. A good many of these people are still sort of making speeches related to the past without relating them to the on-going drive and force of this stream of effort that is now going in. So I think you have got to judge them against the program as you know it, as it has been released, as we have presented it to the Congress.

With respect to the specific items that you asked, when will we do one thing or another ahead of them, I don't know what they are going to do. We were rather expecting a multimanned flight at some time. I have stated many times, and so have my colleagues, that they would probably do a multimanned orbital flight around the earth before we could. They will probably do a circumlunar multimanned flight before we had the booster capacity to do it. But when it comes to doing all of the things required to make a landing on the moon and return, our program was going to develop the power to do that ahead of them. They may take a different tack than anything that we have indicated.

We ourselves may change our program. We have pointed out very, very clearly that we are developing technological capacity and that we are going to be guided by the developments that occur, that we are running a flexible program, and that we will, if we run into an insuperable obstacle in one area, we will move over and do something else. So I don't think you can match up the planned schedule which we have announced with some, say, speculation as to what their planned schedule may be.

Question. Dr. Seamans, there are increasing scientific and engineering doubts being weighed now that we may be overprogrammed; that with Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo, and a versatile booster of unmanned satellites, we may be attempting to whack

off too big a piece at once and we could get there a lot faster if we simplified our programs. What is your answer to that?

Dr. SEAMANS. My answer to that is that we have very carefully reviewed the Mercury, the Gemini, and the Apollo in order to have a concerted effort that would get the maximum out of each one of these projects. We think they all play a very real role in the total manned space effort, and we would be most reluctant to give up any part of the program. We feel that we are learning as we go along with the Mercury up to 1 day, with Gemini, with several astronauts up to a week or more with rendezvous capability, and then with Apollo. If you notice the way the program is organized, no one of these projects is contingent upon the other in the sense that one contractor has several of these jobs and hence might serve as a bottleneck.

Question. But are you not diffusing your scientific manpower and budget by so many things?

Dr. DRYDEN. Let me try a hand at that.

When the space agency was formed we took over the then existing Saturn project. This is now going forward. In a year or two we will be flying this.

The only way to advance space flight is to fly. And the astronauts of the United States cannot rely on the flight experience of the astronauts of some other country.

If you stopped Mercury and Gemini, you would do nothing in the way of space flight until the other vehicles came along. We are using what we have got. We are using Atlas, Titan in the Gemini program. You can't use a booster that you don't have. And it does not seem wise to stop all manned space flight until you have the C-5, for example. This just doesn't make any sense.

We couldn't suspend our operations, close down all our tracking teams for 18 months and then try to revive it again. Just because somebody else in another country flies an airplane, we don't stop training our pilots and say they have flown, there aren't all these mysterious effects. We have to get the experience with our own people. And to get the experience we have to keep flying.

Mr. WEBB. Let me take one little cut at that. We have talked a lot about big boosters. When we planned the Mercury program, the Atlas was the biggest booster we had. When the Titan became available, we planned the Gemini program to use the Titan and which was the biggest booster available to us and put under development the Advanced Saturn which will give us a 10 times bigger booster.

So we are actually using the biggest boosters we have to get the biggest manned spacecraft into use as early as possible.

I think Dr. Dryden alluded to that, but I would like to put it in those terms.

Question. Dr. Dryden, aside from whatever Soviet planning or intent might be involved, what do you think their chances are, capabilitywise, to circumlunar flight without landing on the moon? Are they close to it?

Dr. DRYDEN. I think I have been telling you and the Congress for years that there is a possibility that the Soviets can do circumlunar flight before we can. I once said there is a 50-50 chance, certainly no better than that, that we could do that as early as they can. It is for this reason, in fact, that our national goal was set at the lunar flight because this does require another booster on the part of the Russians as well as ourselves.

Ever since the space agency has been formed we have been waiting for this other shoe to be dropped. People have told us every month, the Russians are going to produce this big booster in the next few months. Now 4 years have gone by and they have not yet shown us this big booster. To the best of our knowledge they have developed lighter weight nuclear weapons and ballistic

missiles rather than bigger space boosters. This is not to say that they may not be doing this. All I am saying is that they will require a bigger booster to land men on the moon, and it was largely for that reason, I think, that the goal was selected that far into the future.

Question. Dr. Dryden, what would your guess be about what the next Soviet mission would be? We didn't go very far wrong with our guess on this one. We said a multi-manned mission, one man in two vehicles. What would your guess be about the next one?

Dr. DRYDEN. I don't really know. They may, of course, continue along the line of development of a rendezvous. We don't know exactly what their experience has been with these two men. All we know is that they have survived it. We know nothing as yet about the effects which have been measured on the two men.

I think that it is possible now that they will move to a multimanned mission of some sort with more than one man in the same vehicle. Certainly the weights that are available to them would seem to make this possible.

Question. Would NASA find this kind of group flight useful?

Dr. DRYDEN. Not as a step in our program at the present time. This brings to mind the fact that our own rendezvous experiments are planned between a manned vehicle and an unmanned vehicle. It is not necessary that the rendezvous be between two manned vehicles.

Question. Do you think it is possible this was a stunt, something that they could have done before?

Dr. DRYDEN. The characteristic of the Russian program has been to seek for something startling and new. This is quite correct. Whether you want to call this a stunt or not, I don't know. It has moved forward in advancing their technical capabilities. I don't think you want to underestimate that.

Question. There have been proposals, Air Force in origin, for Air Force crew participation in Gemini or Gemini-type flights, and also for a military orbital test satellite. Can you comment at all on the status of these proposals in terms of interface—

Mr. WEBB. As I have said, we have had the very closest coordinated effort. We have many common projects. The X-15 is a concrete example. The Gemini project itself involves their launching of the Atlas and the Agena, the unmanned part of the program.

We have invited them to submit names of astronauts for the new group. They have done so. And undoubtedly most of the new astronauts will be men from our armed services. All of the present ones are.

When you say participation in the crews, all of the present crews have come from the Department of Defense.

Question. I didn't mean it that way, sir. I meant more in terms of programs that would be, or a program that would be in conjunction with the Gemini program to give specific military crew experience in orbital space flight.

Mr. WEBB. I would say that just as our program, the civilian program, has used military boosters, if we develop vehicles that are useful to them, all of us in the Government would be most happy for them to use them.

Question. Mr. Webb, one final clarification on spending. You said that a faster rate of spending, faster than the doubling each year, could speed up our program. But you haven't said, I think, whether you yourself will recommend this.

Mr. WEBB. You see, I haven't decided exactly what position would be in the interest of this agency, considering the total problem. I have to consider the specific things we want, but I have to do it in the light of the total program.

Remember, I have to sit as a member of the Space Council, as well as the Administrator of this agency. This means a slightly different responsibility than just to advocate a program for this agency as against all others.

Question. This Russian flight has not changed your mind about this rate of spending?

Mr. WEBB. No, it has not. I think we have a solid program that is going to get a real job done and in faster order than most people think, or at least the critics think.

Question. Mr. Webb, if I heard you correctly, you have said fairly positively that we will beat the Russians to the moon?

Mr. WEBB. I have said in my opinion, considering the rapid advance of our program and the resources being devoted to it, if continued consistently and utilized effectively over the period of this decade, I think we will make the lunar landing and return before they do.

Question. Dr. Dryden, if I heard him correctly, said we are not sure where they stand on their booster program. So how do you reconcile this?

Mr. WEBB. I don't know that we can exactly reconcile every comment that we make here. I am judging as an administrator on the basis of what happens when you put large resources into a program like this, and my judgment is that it will be very difficult for them to make the rate of progress that these resources invested here indicate for us. He may be judging on a technical ground.

Question. But if they started test firing big boosters tomorrow, it would indicate they might beat us. Is it just optimism?

Dr. DRYDEN. They would have to man-rate this booster, as we will.

Question. If they started, say, 3 years—if they should start next month, for example, do we actually know—

Dr. DRYDEN. There are 8 years between now and the end of the decade. If you talk about a leadtime of this much; then intensive effort could make up a gap of that sort.

Mr. WEBB. But if they should begin to fly next month, as you say, something like the Saturn C-5, it would undoubtedly change my mind.

Question. I was curious if you had any information on the state of the art of their boosters, or if the statement was supported by hope and optimism?

Mr. WEBB. It is judgment.

Question. Mr. Webb, I am a little uncertain about an earlier question. Did you say that we had tracked the Soviet—

Mr. WEBB. No, I didn't say. I referred the question to Dr. Dryden, and he answered as best he could at the time.

Question. Have we been tracking it?

Dr. DRYDEN. I think the only statement to make is this: The NASA tracking system is designed to track our own vehicles primarily. During this period we have been tracking seven vehicles, as I see, or eight, including tracking of Echo, which some citizens still seem to want. This is quite a workload on our network.

We are able, as are many amateurs, to record voice and telemetry on 20 megacycles, and we are doing some of that.

Question. Are any Government agencies tracking?

Dr. DRYDEN. You will have to ask the Government agencies involved. It is not our mission to track.

Question. For how many years will the program double annually?

Mr. WEBB. I think if the decision of the Nation is to—I doubt in 1964 that the build-up of the program will require a doubling. This is a decision the President will have to make. So I would guess that 1963, without changing the status of the program, would be the last year that it would double. But I think the increase for 1964 would be

quite substantial, something slightly less than double.

Question. Dr. Dryden, did I understand you correctly that you believe the Russians could make a circumlunar trip with their present booster and capsule combination?

Dr. DRYDEN. It is very marginal. I don't know.

Question. How many ships today are the Russian space people working?

Dr. DRYDEN. I don't know.

Question. Mr. Webb, there has been a growing school of thought until the last weekend that possibly the Russians have abdicated on their race to the moon and we are going on our own. Based on last weekend are you convinced that that assumption was erroneous?

Mr. WEBB. I don't think you can run the programs of the United States on what you describe as the growing feeling over a period of time. We have a program which is funded by the Congress, and is proceeding to do the things that we regard as necessary in our national interest, and we expect to push ahead meeting that schedule in every way that we possible can.

I would like to point out to you another thing that is very, very important here. In the process of putting this program in motion, we have accumulated a basic ground network of resources from assembly and large test areas like the Mississippi test facility to large launching capacity at the cape, to connections between Huntsville, Michoud, Mississippi, and the cape and the manned spacecraft center at Houston. This is a capacity on which you could build an accelerated program very readily. It is something that would take you a long time to accumulate if you didn't have it.

We have the basis in our ongoing program, including the network of facilities, to move very rapidly if this should be the national decision.

Question. Sir, do you know anything new now about Russian landing techniques, and are they landing on dry land? If so, how?

Mr. WEBB. May I refer that to Dr. Dryden? He said "anything new" on the techniques. Dr. DRYDEN. I don't know of anything new. I suppose that they are landing by parachute, as they have been doing, mainly.

Question. Mr. Webb, is there any feeling in NASA that this shot was designed to overshadow the anniversary of the Berlin wall, this particular timing?

Mr. WEBB. We are not the department to make those kinds of analyses. We have done the research in aeronautics here for many years and are still doing it.

We are doing the research in technology and development in space, and have become operational as an agency for space flights. We are not trying to assess the political intentions of these other countries.

Question. Dr. Dryden, could you estimate what kind of a payload they could escape into a circumlunar trajectory with the existing Vostok carrier?

Dr. SEAMANS. As you know, about 50 percent of what you put into earth orbit you can take into an escape mode. Giving them the full benefit of, say 14,000 pounds, with one, if they can rendezvous them, which is questionable for this particular mission, they would then have 14,000 pounds in a lunar trajectory, which is a very, very small weight for this particular mission.

Mr. WEBB. You mean they would have it in an earth orbit?

Dr. SEAMANS. If you took up two. If it were just one, they could take about 7,000 pounds on a trajectory to the moon.

Question. 14,000 pounds, including its rocket motors to accelerate from earth orbit?

Dr. SEAMANS. If you start out with 14,000 pounds in earth orbit you will end up, if you have the right configuration and the right propulsion, including high-energy propellants, they might end up with 7,000 pounds on a trajectory to the moon.

Question. I would like to ask Dr. Holmes, What are some of the things you would do if you had the Soviet booster capacity at your disposal?

Mr. HOLMES. Before answering that directly, I would like to point out—and I don't mean to be sanguine at all—but I think that we have known for some time that the Soviets have had a booster that they have used over and over and it should be reliable by use, and it is, and it did have a thrust much larger than anything we have had. I think the experiment or mission, whatever you want to call it, as performed, every element of it is directly related to just exactly that fact, from the timing of launch, reliability of the booster, from the size or capacity of the object launched, the payload capacity of the booster, from the reliability which they must have had in their environmental systems to operate over that period of time, payload capacity again, size, nothing crammed together.

So that I think if we had the booster, now to answer your question, in other words, I don't think it is surprising, I think it is an accomplishment but it is something we knew they had all along. If we had that booster I think we probably would be doing the kind of thing that we are heading for doing with Gemini earlier.

In other words, we are struggling in this country, as Mr. Webb has pointed out, and Dr. Dryden and Dr. Seamans, for more booster capacity. And if we had that capacity today we certainly would be doing longer mission flights or maybe multimanned flights, or things where you could experiment with more weight in orbit at an earlier date.

Mr. WEBB. I think maybe some of you are getting tired of this. We can take a couple of more questions. I don't want to cut it off if you want to stay.

Question. I have a psychological question, about psychological atmosphere in the NASA, in some sections of NASA. The thing is that some honorable reporters from Cape Canaveral quoted some NASA representatives, and named them, as saying some rather gloomy predictions. For example, a miracle needed to beat Russians in the moon drive.

Some of your papers pointed out about the difficulties and the pessimistic mood of NASA. Can you comment on this?

Mr. WEBB. I think you would have to judge that. We are here, the senior officials concerned with this, and we have expressed our opinions to you very freely in answer to your questions. Any such persons from the cape are not authorized to speak for the agency, nor were they in full possession of all the facts that we gentlemen have.

I think you have to judge that on the basis of the answers we give to your questions.

I do not feel pessimistic, if you ask me personally.

Question. I understood your position, but still the papers, for example, some morning papers—and it is widely publicized in the whole provincial press—said about some sections of NASA.

Dr. DRYDEN. There are 22,000 people in NASA. If you can't find one pessimist among them, there is something wrong.

Dr. SEAMANS. I would like to say, I am not a bit gloomy. We don't claim to be perfect prophets, but as others have said, we anticipated that the Soviets would be carrying out additional flights. We have laid out an extremely good program.

We have, we think, excellent resources within NASA. We know we have excellent resources in our industrial complex. We know that our universities have a very strong scientific background. And this country is moving into space.

Mr. WEBB. I think you could say one other thing. There were people here a year or two ago who were saying: What is the use of doing anything because you will never catch the Russians? I would say that seldom in

the history of any nation has as much been accomplished in a 12-month period of time as this agency has accomplished in a very advanced area of science, technology, operations, and courageous men to fly the vehicles.

Question. Thank you very much, sir. (Thereupon, at 4:25 p.m., the conference was concluded.)

NEEDED: CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS ON MILITARY POTENTIALS OF SOVIET MANNED SPACECRAFT PROGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Madam President, the Soviets success in orbiting *Vostok III* and *IV* raises—in my judgment—new questions about the military dangers to free world security.

The two-Red-men-in-space project demonstrated marked proficiency in launching, controlling, maneuvering, intercommunication in orbit, and landing of manned spacecraft.

Further development of such manned spacecraft has a great military potential, possibly for, first, locating and zeroing in on strategic targets in the free world; second, either manning directly, or guiding, missiles for attack; third, keying attacks for destroying or neutralizing free world strikeback power; and fourth, playing a variety of major roles in any offensive launched by the Communists.

Realistically, then, we must not be caught with our "feet in cement" on our launching pads, or asleep as before Pearl Harbor. Rather, we must rapidly appraise—and take measures to counter—any military advantages inherent in the Soviet manned spacecraft program.

For this reason, I am proposing that Congress, prior to adjournment, conduct hearings on the military potential of these new developments in space. The hearings, including testimony from the Defense Department, NASA, and other scientific and military experts, I believe, would serve the interests of our long-range national security.

Globally, there has persisted hope—if waning—that outer space would be dedicated to peaceful purposes. Officially this is the goal of U.S. policy.

Unfortunately, however, the Communists have been unwilling to agree realistically on arms control on earth. Moreover, there is no evidence to demonstrate their willingness to agree—other than verbally—to limiting space activities to peaceful, nonmilitary purposes.

Because of these factors, then, I believe it is extremely urgent that we obtain, as soon as possible, a realistic evaluation of the military dangers of these new developments in space; and following this, undertake the appropriate, realistic measures to provide for our security.

COOPERATION IN WESTERN WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT IS A TWO-WAY STREET

Mr. MOSS. Madam President, the common interest we in the Federal Government have with the State governments in solving our mutual problems—and particularly our water resource development problems—was spelled out in

some detail in a speech made by Reclamation Commissioner Floyd E. Dominy at a meeting of the Association of Western State Engineers in Salt Lake City, Utah, on August 15.

The speech summarized the fields in which advancement must be made if we are to make our second 60 years of reclamation development as fruitful for the West as the first 60 years have been. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Dominy's excellent address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPERATION IN WESTERN WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT IS A TWO-WAY STREET

(By Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy)

The theme of this meeting: "How the Individual States Can Best Fit Into the Resources Development Program," suggests an obvious and simple answer when applied to the water resources field.

The States belong right in the middle of it—doing everything States can do, in cooperation with local and private entities and the Federal Government.

These views, which I have held during more than a quarter of a century of Federal service, and which I still hold, were not developed during my years in Washington. They were conceived on the drought-parched plains of the neighboring State of Wyoming during the 1930's when I was a young county agricultural agent trying to cope with the twin disasters of drought and economic depression.

And if there are times when you think you have a bellyful of troubles as a State engineer—and I know from mutual experience that you have those moments—just consider my predicament as a county agent, fresh out of college, when hordes of grasshoppers and crickets moved into my predominantly agricultural county and stripped its drought-seared croplands as bare as a table.

Well, someone has observed that every obstacle is an opportunity. This was certainly true in that case, because we all pitched in and worked, not only to salvage a stricken agricultural economy but also to improve our soil and water resources against future emergencies of this type.

Thanks to cooperative Federal-State-local programs, we not only found remunerative work for our distressed livestockmen, but we also directed that effort into building stock water ponds, wells, contour ditches, and other land and water conservation facilities. These depression-born improvements contributed to a more stable agricultural economy after the drought was ended and the water cycle turned upward.

This nostalgic reference to the droughts of the thirties has more than cursory literary interest. Those of us who passed through that distressing experience can't help but twinge inwardly at the recent dry spells ranging from California and the intermountain area to the drought in the extreme East. These sectional droughts, even if they are followed by an ample water supply season such as this area is now enjoying, demonstrate that however much we have accomplished in storage construction and other water supply improvement in the West since the mid-thirties—and it has been a tremendous achievement—we are still susceptible in some areas to the devastation of heavy, prolonged cyclic droughts. For this reason I am especially pleased to meet with you to discuss common problems of water resource development.

Aside from the vagaries of climate, there are other compellingly urgent reasons for the development and conservation of our

water resources. Perhaps the first of these is the rapidly growing population and industrialization of the West. Last spring, your bosses, the western Governors, directed a letter to my boss's boss, President Kennedy. The Governors made this salient point on growth pressures in the West in a cogent statement on the accomplishments of and continuing need for reclamation:

"Population growth in the Western States is much higher than the national average, and all known forecasts indicates this trend will continue. This will require intensive development of the limited water resources of the West, to meet the many diversified requirements outlined in your own statement quoted at the beginning of this letter."

The summary of diversified requirements for water resource development to which the Governor's letter referred was an excerpt from President Kennedy's 1962 conservation message to Congress. In that message early this year, he stated:

"This administration adheres to the policy enunciated in my natural resources message of last year that our available water supply will be used to provide maximum benefits for all purposes—hydroelectric power, irrigation and reclamation, navigation, recreation and wildlife, and municipal and industrial water supply. These diverse uses and our future needs require thoughtful preservation and full development of our national water resources."

As one of your colleagues on the firing line in water resource development, I can heartily subscribe to both of these policy statements—that of the Chief Executive of the Federal Government as well as that of the heads of States in the semiarid and arid West.

This, in fact, is the nub of our resource development challenge—in an area historically deficient in water supply, we are faced with increasing municipal, industrial, and other multipurpose water requirements, while our limited supply of this basic resource is becoming more and more overtaxed and the cost and complexity of project development and construction are steadily increasing. This serious economic-technical challenge confronts us while this Nation is engaged in the second decade of a costly cold war, as we invest multibillions in a shot for the moon, and as other economic demands, some of an emergency nature, compete with the public works program, both on the National and State levels.

It is for this reason that I chose as my title for this talk, "Cooperation in Western Water Resource Development Is a Two-Way Street." No one in this group, I am sure, will seriously deny that our water supply challenge is large and pressing. Nor that cooperation of all water user groups and all levels of government is demanded. These obvious conclusions are implicit in the title. Differences will be found largely in the degree or means of cooperation to meet our objectives. Some extremists have gone so far as to assert that all of the cooperation must be done by the Federal Government.

Suffice it to say that cooperation at all levels is essential, and it must be a two-way street. We must cooperate with you and you must reciprocate by cooperating with us—and both of us must cooperate with the water users. The common denominator of all successful water projects—Federal, State, and private—is cooperative effort to develop and conserve water. If this salient fact is kept in mind, the label on the project loses much of its significance.

One of my chief responsibilities as an agency administrator is to be aware of water resource needs and problems in the States and to keep you on the State level informed of our problems and our program.

Every year at the National Reclamation Association convention we schedule meetings

with State delegations to discuss State problems. We also get together with State officials at meetings like this, and we are in extremely close contact with you and your water groups during the development and legislative authorization of projects. Every 2 years, at the opening of a biennial session of the Congress, we hold mutual briefing sessions with members of your respective State congressional delegations. Consequently we feel that the Bureau of Reclamation, Washington office, and especially our field offices are extremely well informed on problems and accomplishments of the respective Western States, and we hope that our agency information program keeps you informed of our activities.

I would like to mention a few of the achievements on the State level that have come to my attention. Please forgive me if time does not permit an adequate inventory of what individual States are doing in the face of these unprecedented challenges. I can at least suggest some highlights.

Foremost in any summary of State accomplishments would be the intensive efforts of the State of California to plan and bring to successful realization its vast State water program. The internationally known State water plan of California is an outstanding example of a State's initiative, resourcefulness, and determination to increase its water supplies in the decades to come. We are pleased to be associated with this tremendous undertaking in the Federal and joint features of the San Luis unit, which will be supplemented by the State facilities in the plan for the 500-mile-long carriage system of the huge Feather River project.

The Texas State Board of Water Engineers is making substantial contributions to the investigations of the farflung Texas basins project, a proposed Federal-State water resource development of the coastal basins of the Lone Star State. There are many unusual and complex problems to be resolved on this project, including major river crossings for river-sized canals. Hurricanes and rainfall of as much as 24 inches in a single day are included among these problems. The State board is rendering continued assistance and guidance to the Bureau of Reclamation in resolving these and other complicated engineering problems associated with this project.

During the past 10 years, the State of New Mexico has spent more than a million dollars in its attack on water-wasting salt cedar and other phreatophytes in the Middle Rio Grande Valley. These efforts, along with other State and Federal activities in evapotranspiration suppression, will benefit water users throughout the Western United States and in many other parts of the world.

The State of Nebraska has done much to advance factual information on underground water resources in the State. While assisting with the development of extensive pump irrigation facilities, the State has contributed extensively to the knowledge of the technology of subsurface water development—an extremely important area of research and development for the future.

The State Water Board of Montana has a longstanding program to construct water development projects with State resources. Perhaps the most significant of these is the Broadwater-Missouri project, a fine irrigation project on the Missouri River above Helena. And there are a number of other projects throughout the State.

Our host State of Utah, too, has an expanding program of small project construction under the administration of the Utah Water and Power Board.

These and other States have done much to advance the technology and to magnify the role of the States in water resource development. You may be assured that your efforts are known and appreciated by the Federal agencies engaged in this field.

In the limited time remaining, I would like to deal with some specific areas in which the States, the Federal Government, and allied water resource organizations can well accelerate our efforts, either individually, cooperatively, or both. These are a few things we can do or do more effectively to meet water supply challenges of the future.

1. ACCELERATE RESEARCH, INVESTIGATIONS, AND TECHNOLOGICAL IMPROVEMENTS

Under the impact of the cold war and the race for the moon, technological advances are being made at probably the fastest rate in history. We must accelerate research in hydrology, hydraulics, and the entire water resource field in order that new discoveries in materials, electronics, automation, computers, use of radioactive isotopes, and other areas of engineering and pure science be applied with dispatch where appropriate and feasible. We in the Bureau, for example, are currently studying the possibility of using radioactive isotopes to measure the efficiency of hydroelectric turbines. These and other breakthroughs of physical and chemical science and engineering have the potentiality of greatly improving our efforts and reducing costs of project construction, operation, and maintenance. Wise expenditure of research funds today can pay off handsomely in the future. And all public agencies should freely share their findings and participate in the benefits.

For several years now, the Bureau has been engaged in research to develop practical methods of reducing evaporation from storage reservoirs. The importance of this research is indicated by the fact that some 17.7 million acre-feet of water are lost annually through evaporation from freshwater reservoirs and lakes in the 17 Western States alone. Salvage of a major part of this loss would be the same as discovering new water where none existed before.

In recent months, we have brought State institutions into cooperative research efforts in this area. Utah State University, for example, has contracted to study the physical and economic feasibility of applying evaporation-retarding chemicals on reservoir surfaces by the use of low-flying aircraft. The university's research program seeks to develop suitable techniques and equipment for field tests on a reservoir of about 3,000 acres. The Bureau also has a contract with the Desert Research Institute of the University of Nevada, under which the institute is to study climatic and meteorological factors of evaporation and their influence on the process of placing evaporation-reducing chemicals on water surfaces.

State educational institutions also are assisting the Bureau in its program of weather-modification research, undertaken early this year in cooperation with the National Science Foundation and the Weather Bureau. Contracts have been executed with the National Resources Institute of the University of Wyoming; the Institute of Atmospheric Sciences of the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology; and the Desert Research Institute of the University of Nevada. These institutions are studying meteorological conditions and methods of inducing precipitation from suitable moisture-bearing air masses.

The individual States also are to be commended for their initiative in undertaking research in many areas of water resource development. Through the several State universities, advances are being made to improve and supplement water supplies, to enhance basic knowledge in the hydro sciences, and to cooperate with and assist Federal agencies in their research programs. Examples of such research, in addition to those already named, include the work being carried out in hydrology at the University of Idaho, sedimentation at Colorado State University, water salvage at the University of

Arizona, and crop-water requirements at the University of California.

Continuing research efforts are essential if our water resource developments are not to be nullified by waste, improper use, or pollution. State colleges can assist in special studies of water uses and efficiencies of use for particular purposes. What are the economies of production of particular crops on different soils with varying quantities of water? More complete records are needed in most areas of canal diversion, and stream and well pumping.

The increasing emphasis on outdoor recreation warrants emphasis on the value of recreational use of multipurpose water projects. Continued and greater participation in some areas is needed in development and administration of recreational use of reservoir areas.

Research and investigation efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation have increased during recent years. In 1960 only \$931,000 was budgeted for research and \$6,925,497 for investigations and advance planning; comparable figures for the 1963 budget are \$2,252,000 and \$12,527,000, respectively. I hope that comparable support for these all-important activities is being given in the States.

2. ADVANCE COMPREHENSIVE STATEWIDE AND BASINWIDE PLANNING

Increasing pressures for the use of our limited water supplies in the West underscore the need for greater emphasis on comprehensive statewide and basinwide planning of water resource conservation and development. Here the State engineer must play an especially vital role. Working in harmony, State engineers and water board officials of a river basin can contribute immeasurably to the full development of tributary streams and rivers within the basin and thus assure integration of basin resources for the widest possible use in the public interest.

A prime example of this cooperative effort is the development of the Upper Colorado River Basin. With cooperation and mutual understanding, the State engineers and water boards of the five upper basin States have worked closely with the Bureau and the Congress to bring into fruition the Colorado River storage project and participating projects. All State engineers of the West can share the pride of these engineers in their cooperative achievement. Already, the partially completed project is an international showpiece of multiple-use planning and development of a major river basin in a semiarid region.

The basin approach to water resource development planning, as you are aware, also has been most successfully applied in the Lone-Star State by the Texas Study Commission. This approach to integrated resource planning is incorporated in the Aspinall and Anderson bills now before the Congress. These bills, in substance, would authorize the establishment of study commissions patterned after the Texas Study Commission for all river basins where such cooperative action is desired. My experience of a quarter century in western resource development has convinced me of the need both for the basinwide approach to planning and for the maximum participation in such planning by the States involved. I solicit your attention to this basin planning legislation which is sponsored by two outstanding western legislators. It merits your serious consideration and your support.

Basinwide planning, of course, puts additional burdens upon the States for investigations and review of proposed projects and for determination of water rights. This is especially true in States like Utah and Wyoming which are intersected by more than one drainage basin. The administration has recognized this problem and has recommended legislation to make Federal grants

for States to accomplish the planning required for basinwide development.

One of the pressing needs for State-Federal cooperation in this area is the establishment of a common basis for appraisal of water needs advanced by the various competing users of water, and amicable settlement of such differences in the public interest. With increasing frequency, projects are being unduly delayed or even frustrated by conflicts over future uses which normally must be worked out within the States involved. Such conflicts are bound to increase, both in number and intensity, as the available water supply diminishes. We can help the individual States by providing objective data from our studies or by keeping them informed of practical solutions that have been worked out elsewhere.

3. UTILIZE INTERSTATE AND INTERNATIONAL COMPACTS TO AVOID OR REDUCE DELAYS AND COSTS OF LITIGATION

I feel that this injunction does not require amplification in this conference, simply because it is a fact that the West is about a half century ahead of the rest of the country in the development and utilization of compact. The current rapid development of the upper Colorado River storage project, of course, is a testimony to the effectiveness of a forward-looking interstate compact in resolving differences and allocating water supply in one of our most moisture-deficient regions.

4. SEEK TO IMPROVE AND BRING ABOUT NEEDED UNIFORMITY IN OUR WATER LAWS AND POLICIES

To assure continued cooperation in the Upper Colorado River Basin and in other western river basins, there must be concerted effort to modernize and to achieve uniformity and legal compatibility of the water laws of the respective States. We are hopeful that the State engineers, with their technical skills and knowledge of basin water resource development, will continue to strive to achieve modernization and uniformity of laws pertaining both to surface and subsurface waters, and to iron out differences in basic principles of water rights and properties. Changing national patterns in such factors as the urban-rural population balance and in leisure and recreational activities focus attention upon the adequacy of existing water codes.

One of the difficult problems in this area is the padding and pyramiding of water rights that have occurred in some States. If accepted at face value, these "paper rights" frequently suffice to exhaust the annual supply of a given stream and leave no water for new developments. Such situations, as many of you are aware, are increasingly a cause of concern and it is my conviction that unless these padded and pyramided rights are sought out and eliminated by the States, there will be increasing demands that the Congress consider some sort of Federal legislation to deal with the problem as a condition of congressional authorization and appropriation of funds for future development on the streams affected. Some States, I am pleased to report, have acted to cope with this problem in recent changes in water codes, and I hope that State engineers and water rights boards in other areas where such conditions exist will emulate their example.

State engineers also can contribute to movements to achieve greater uniformity among Federal laws governing reclamation, flood control, soil conservation, water pollution, recreation, fish and wildlife, and other policies affecting national growth and prosperity. We have no apologies to make for the policies which have been developed in six decades of water resource development under the reclamation laws, and we are supporting the efforts of the administration

to achieve greater uniformity among the laws, policies, and procedures of the multiple Federal agencies engaged in water resource development.

5. UTILIZE AVAILABLE FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Most State engineers and other State water officials were among the staunch supporters of the National Reclamation Association in its efforts to achieve authorization of the Small Reclamation projects program in the early 1950's. However, since the program was authorized in 1956, water user organizations in only eight reclamation States and Hawaii have initiated requests for projects under this program. Total participation under this program, which provides Federal grants and loans up to a maximum of \$5 million to a project, is shown in the following summary:

Small reclamation projects

State	Applications approved	Amount of loans and grants
Arizona.....	2	\$7,400,000
California.....	11	35,405,930
Colorado.....	1	270,000
Hawaii.....	1	4,514,000
Idaho.....	1	2,498,000
Nevada.....	1	693,000
Oregon.....	1	942,100
Texas.....	2	8,667,000
Utah.....	7	7,047,000
Total.....		67,437,030

A new Federal program now underway, the area redevelopment program, also should be of interest to State water officials. It may be that we have been doing our job too well here in the West, but the greatest amount of interest in irrigation development under this program so far has been evinced by rural areas in the East and the South. The Bureau of Reclamation is one of the Federal agencies participating in this program and I solicit your attention to it.

I am sure that you were as pleased as we were with the recent actions of the Congress in authorizing several new major reclamation projects. This congressional support in a period when the reclamation program has been a whipping boy for agricultural surpluses in other areas is most gratifying to us who acutely feel the need for an authorized shelf of projects adequate to keep construction moving forward on a consistent basis. With the addition of the new projects to our going program, I believe the Bureau of Reclamation can justify annual appropriation requests in excess of \$300 million for much of the current decade. This, I am sure you will agree, represents real economic progress for the Western States.

The importance of unified State action in furthering resources development is emphasized by the concerted and aggressive action taken by the State of Colorado in the recent congressional consideration of the Frypan-Arkansas project. Coloradans representing a cross section of the State's business and political life displayed impressive unanimity in support of the bill, so vital to the State's growth. It was one of the greatest displays of solidarity on major reclamation legislation in Colorado history and resulted in passage of a bill which had lost out in previous actions when unanimity was lacking. This demonstrated ability of congressional and State officials and water-user groups to work in unity for needed resource development is commended for attention by officials of the other Western States.

In this regard, I also enjoin you and other State officials to do everything you can to educate your colleagues and other influential people in other States on the water needs of the West. Much time and energy has been spent by us in the past year trying to answer inquiries on why it is necessary to de-

velop water in the West when we have mountains of agricultural surpluses in storage. This question is raised in spite of the fact that we have consistently emphasized the long-term nature of reclamation development and despite the inclusion of provisions against the growth of crops currently in surplus in most recent project authorizations. All of us interested in continued water resource development in the West must continually strive to inform people and organizations elsewhere on the overwhelming need to develop our extremely limited water resources to the maximum, in the public interest, and the role that irrigation plays in the economic aspects of this program.

In closing, I wish to call your attention to the informal observance this year of the 60th anniversary of the reclamation program. During these six decades, this agency has administered the investment of \$3.8 billion in the construction of 132 projects or units of projects in 18 Western States. Projects authorized or under construction provide for an additional investment of \$4.7 billion.

We in the Bureau do not look upon these projects as purely Federal undertakings. They are, rather, local resource development capital investments—built with Federal, State, and water-user participation. And to those of us who understand the implications of water resource development in the West, there is little doubt that these essentially local resources projects have a large measure of national importance. If anyone doubts this, I invite him to visit the thriving Utah communities along the Wasatch front, as well as, Phoenix, Yakima, Boise, and many other commercial-industrial centers whose present size and prosperity is based largely upon a water supply regulation made possible by Federal reclamation projects.

The water resource developments of the past 60 years—Federal, State, and private—have played a major role in the amazing population and industrial growth of the West. And there is no doubt that continued water resource conservation and development will play an even more important role during the next half century and beyond.

As water resource officials, we have a common interest in solving the technical, legal, and financial problems that may delay or impede this development program. These problems are and will continue to be manifold and complex. They will demand the utmost in effort and cooperation. We in the Bureau of Reclamation assure you of our interest in and personal concern for continued resource development in the West. And we solicit your continued cooperation on this two-way street to area population growth and industrial expansion.

NEEDED: EQUITABLE OIL IMPORT CONTROL SYSTEM—JOBS FOR AMERICANS, NOT A DOLE—SEVERE UNEMPLOYMENT AND LOSS OF MARKETS RESULT FROM PRESENT POLICY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, there continues to be a pressing need for the establishment of a more equitable control system for the imports of crude oil and its derivatives and products, including residual fuel oil.

The existing program is disruptive of the domestic fuels industries. It does not seem sufficiently to take into account the need to assure an adequate supply of fuels to meet any national emergency or condition growing out of international political developments which would disrupt the supply of fuels from foreign countries. Parenthetically, I

express the emphatic view that too much reliance is placed in this country at this time on foreign supplies of residual fuel oil. This reliance on offshore sources by too many utility, industrial, and defense installation users is dangerous. And it does nothing to restore economic strength to many areas of our country now suffering severe unemployment and business recessions caused by loss of markets for their mineral-fuel products.

That which is needed is an oil import control system which will provide a fair access to markets for domestic fuels—a system which will enable these domestic industries to maintain a level of production and transportation adequate as a base from which to expand supplies at any time national defense or a sudden emergency should require.

There must be reestablished a greater degree of stability in the fuels markets of this country.

An equitable control system would provide a level of permissible imports which will augment, but not usurp, the growing energy demands of American industrial and other consumers. And the level must be stabilized as much as possible and maintained over a long-term period so as to:

First. Permit proper planning for financing new and replacement production facilities;

Second. Make possible necessary development of future economical transportation facilities for fuels;

Third. Encourage the signing of long-term contracts by coal and its consumers as a principal means of holding prices down; and

Fourth. Stimulate increased exploration activity by the domestic oil industry.

Important coal producing areas of our country must be enabled to reduce unemployment and to restore economically depressed communities to healthy status.

As a means toward the accomplishment of these proper and necessary objectives, the National Coal Policy Conference, representing coal producers, the United Mine Workers of America, the coal-carrying railroads, major coal consuming utilities, and manufacturers of coal mining machinery and equipment, in concert with the Independent Petroleum Association of America and the Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners, have recommended a pertinent amendment to the proposed Trade Extension Act—H.R. 11970—now under consideration by the Committee on Finance. I have recorded my support in a statement to the committee. I will continue to urge its acceptance.

Meanwhile, the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., in behalf of its state committees from Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia—working for the economic recovery of the bituminous coal industry, published today in the Washington Post a message addressed to President Kennedy in the form of an advertisement. Its headline: "Americans Need Jobs—Not a Dole, Mr. President."

It is appropriate that the attention of all Members be directed to the Coal

Policy Conference message to the President of the United States, because I have the feeling that it is a message which could and perhaps should be addressed with equal appropriateness to the Congress. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the text of that message—advertisement—as published on page A-11 of the Washington, D.C., Post, Tuesday, August 21, 1962.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANS NEED JOBS—NOT A DOLE, MR. PRESIDENT

President Kennedy: We must end unemployment and move the economy ahead as you said in your recent television address on the state of the Nation's economy.

But a dole and a handout of surplus food are not the answer.

Only jobs will solve America's economic problems.

Extended unemployment compensation, aid to children of the unemployed, job retraining, work camps for unemployed youth * * * all of these things are fine and what you have done to ease the hardship of America's unfortunate unemployed families is commendable. But they are only stopgap measures.

You say that employment and income are rising nationally and that other economic indicators do not warrant the conclusion that we are entering a new recession.

Unfortunately, this is not true of coal communities. Unemployment in some coal communities is not 5 or 6 percent—like the national average—but as high as 35 or 40 percent.

Our people want jobs.

You can help put them to work—right now—in the coalfields of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Illinois, and Ohio * * * pockets of persistent unemployment and economic distress * * * in which, as you said in your TV address, coal miners can no longer find jobs to support their families.

How can you create the jobs our people want and need?

By using the powers of your office to stem the flood of foreign residual fuel oil imports.

This imported waste product of foreign refining operations is taking jobs away from American coal miners in those very pockets of distress where the Government has been forced to undertake expensive temporary remedial action. If you cut back the amount of residual oil which can now be imported, and limit imports in the future, many of the unemployed miners will again find work and become self-supporting. No longer will their families be subjected to the degrading experience of living on Government handouts. They will again become taxpayers—good customers of the local merchant.

The coal industry is the key to economic recovery in many of the Nation's pockets of unemployment.

But the coal industry cannot expand production and employment; it cannot put these unemployed miners back to work at productive jobs as long as imported waste residual oil is permitted to take over coal markets.

The power to end this threat to economic expansion, to expanded employment, to economic vigor and growth in widespread areas of the Nation, rests with you, Mr. President.

We respectfully urge you to act today.

This message is published by the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., in behalf of the following State committees working for the economic recovery of the bituminous coal industry:

The Illinois State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference.

The Indiana State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference.

The Kentucky State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference.

The Maryland State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference.

The Ohio State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference.

The Pennsylvania State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference.

The Tennessee State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference.

The Virginia State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference.

The West Virginia State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, perhaps there is some measure of exaggeration in the frame of reference applied to use of the word "dole," but I do know that the coal policy conference committees of the several coal-producing States are totally accurate in expressing the view that Americans need jobs. And there is an understandable wrath that Americans have been displaced and are being displaced from their jobs more and more by the permitted influx of larger and larger and larger quantities of a waste product—yes, a waste product—of foreign oil refineries.

PROGRESS OF RADIO BROADCASTING INDUSTRY

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, every day we are impressed more and more by the degree to which the radio broadcasting industry has become a part of living in America.

Its progress in 40 years has been phenomenal. The antenna which dots the countryside of nearly every community has become a source of vital, necessary information making life better for all of us.

The broadcasting industry has not achieved such progress without its problems, economic and governmental. The amazing fact is that it has made such progress in the face of such great obstacles.

Great as has been the progress of the broadcasting industry—great as its service to the Nation has become—there still are underserved areas around the Nation. How to provide that needed improvement has been the subject of many discussions in the Congress and much legislation.

Everybody agrees complete service is desirable. Everybody agrees it must be provided without injury to any segment of the industry. Just as in other phases of our commercial life the small business is the bulwark of a stable, free-enterprise economy, so the local stations, many of them daytime operators, are essential to the long-range continuation and further development of the service which the industry provides. Thrive they must. At the same time, we have an obligation to provide an adequate service to those underserved areas still on broadcasting maps.

It was in an attempt to solve this problem that on July 20, 1961, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], I introduced S. 2990, to amend the Communications Act of 1934.

The purpose of our bill was to require the Federal Communications Commission

to take effective steps at once to improve radio service to millions of Americans who have received inadequate nighttime service for far too many years.

Some have said that after more than 40 years of broadcasting history, almost 60 percent of the land area of the continental United States, covering more than 25 million rural and smalltown Americans, is without acceptable nighttime radio groundwave signal. This is true even though there are some 2,000 fulltime broadcast stations.

These 25 million Americans rely on clear channel skywave signals for their only source of nighttime radio service. Additional millions must rely on clear channel skywave signals for their only choice of nighttime radio programs.

Because of the Commission's power ceiling of 50 kilowatts, the skywave signals of clear channel stations are not adequate to provide acceptable nighttime radio signals to these 25 million Americans.

Because of the laws of physics and economics and the nature of the population distribution in the continental United States, no more than a fraction of the millions of underserved Americans can be provided with acceptable nighttime groundwave signals.

Thus, adequate nighttime radio service can be accomplished only by improving the nighttime skywave signals of clear channel stations. I am told the only feasible way to do this is to keep clear channel frequencies free of further duplication and authorize class I-A clear channel stations to operate with power in excess of 50 kilowatts.

Although the Federal Communications Commission has recognized for a long time the existence of the problem of inadequate nighttime radio service, it has done nothing to remedy the problem. In fact, the Commission in the summer of 1961 proposed to take action which would worsen rather than improve the situation.

It was because of these facts, which are recited in greater detail in volume 107, part 10, page 12974 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 20, 1961, that Senator TALMADGE and I cosponsored S. 2290 which would amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to prohibit duplication or breakdown of class I-A clear channel frequencies beyond that authorized as of July 1, 1961. We were, and are, of the opinion that the section 303(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 expressly authorizes the Commission to improve service to the millions living in the present radio "desert" by permitting class I-A clear channel stations to operate with power in excess of 50 kilowatts. The resolution passed by the Senate in 1938 (S. Res. 294) which expressed a viewpoint against the use of higher power, did not amend the basic law, died with that session of Congress and is in no way a bar to the authorization of higher power by the FCC. Accordingly, our bill, S. 2290, did not propose to amend that portion of the existing law which gives the Commission the power to authorize higher power.

This, in brief, was the setting which led to the introduction of S. 2290 which

is still pending before the Committee on Commerce.

Similar legislation was introduced in the House of Representatives. Hearings were held by the House and on July 2, 1962, it enacted House Resolution 714.

House Resolution 714 urges that all of the existing clear channels be preserved by the Commission in their present status for a period of 1 year. The report accompanying House Resolution 714 emphasizes that the 1-year moratorium would give all class I-A clear channel stations an opportunity to file with the Commission applications for the use of power in excess of 50 kilowatts. Finally, House Resolution 714 makes clear the view of the House that the Commission is free to and should authorize the use of power in excess of 50 kilowatts by clear channel stations where the use of higher power will bring improved nighttime radio service to underserved rural regions and otherwise serve the public interest.

Let me say, Madam President, that I endorse House Resolution 714 as wise and needed. Had we not faced such a crowded schedule in the Senate, I would have strongly urged that the Senate take similar action. On the other hand, it is questionable whether such action is now needed. It is difficult to believe that the Commission will not heed the excellent advice of the House.

All Americans should receive adequate radio service. This problem can be solved easily and without harm to anyone by keeping all of our clear channels intact and free of further duplication and by authorizing higher power as suggested by House Resolution 714. We also know that clear channels and higher power are valuable both now and in the future in civil and military defense.

I commend the House for its wisdom in enacting House Resolution 714 and urge the Commission to implement its suggestions at once.

FILMS FOR THE DEAF

Mr. PELL. Madam President, when I commented on the passage of S. 2511—captioned films for the deaf—earlier this month, I paid tribute to the diligent work of the former Senator from Connecticut, Senator Purtell, who introduced S. 1889 in the 85th Congress which resulted in establishing the initial program of captioned films for the deaf. Recently, I received a letter from Senator Purtell commenting on the bill, which I ask unanimous consent be printed in the RECORD. Let me take this occasion to reiterate my hope that the House will soon take favorable action on this measure which means so much to the deaf of our Nation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST HARTFORD, CONN.,
August 15, 1962.

The Honorable CLAIBORNE PELL,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PELL: I indeed regret the unavoidable delay in replying to your kind letter of August 2 relative to the hearings on S. 2511.

I introduced in the Senate the original bill concerning captioned films for the deaf because I and my colleagues recognized the urgent need for a means by which the educational, cultural, and entertainment value of films might be available to the deaf, and particularly the deaf children in our schools for the deaf and elsewhere, who, through lack of hearing, were denied the opportunities for knowledge through sound films.

The obvious need can quickly be understood while watching an educational, documentary, or current events film on television with the sound turned off. It appeared then that this field of captioned films was one that could be properly and perhaps only served through an agency of the Federal Government. The worthwhileness of the program is best attested to by the enthusiastic response it has received.

I have been informed that the demand for captioned films is increasing even more rapidly than had been anticipated. I therefore wish to convey to your committee my hope that such amendments as may be needed to carry out the original intent of the act be adopted.

I would indeed be grateful if you would convey to your present and my former colleagues on the most important Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, my warm regards and high esteem.

With warm regards.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. PURTELL.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business is H.R. 12391, the farm bill.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12391) to improve and protect farm income, to reduce costs of farm programs to the Federal Government, to reduce the Federal Government's excessive stocks of agricultural commodities, to maintain reasonable and stable prices of agricultural commodities and products to consumers, to provide adequate supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic and foreign needs, to conserve natural resources, and for other purposes.

PROCEDURE BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, earlier today I spoke briefly concerning proposed legislation pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations which involves authorization of the expenditure of large sums of money to build American embassies and chanceries and to purchase real estate abroad for use by the U.S. Government.

I have made it clear in the Committee on Foreign Relations and on the floor of the Senate that I shall object to any meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations for the consideration of those bills while the Senate is in session. I shall oppose those bills in case they should be reported to the Senate by the

Committee on Foreign Relations. If the Foreign Relations Committee proposes to act on them prior to adjournment I shall insist that a quorum be present. I shall oppose any polling of the committee members in regard to those bills, and for the following reason: In my judgment, the economy of the United States should be considered to be of the most critical concern by the Congress and the House of Representatives between now and the time of adjournment.

Since I made my speech earlier in the day, the Associated Press ticker announced that the national debt had risen to more than \$300 billion for the first time. The Treasury announced yesterday that as of August 15, the total debt was \$300,133,027,610.51. That is about \$1,600 for every man, woman, and child in the country; but the per capita debt figure is well below the World War II high of nearly \$2,000, because the population has increased faster than the debt. But there is no consolation in the fact that the per capita debt figure has dropped from approximately \$2,000 to \$1,600 for every man, woman, and child in the country, because a per capita national debt of \$1,600 for every man, woman, and child in the country is a serious danger signal, and we had better take heed of it, because, as I have said so many times, the greatest defense weapon we have is our domestic economy, and in my judgment it is not in good condition.

I have been subjected to a considerable amount of criticism and misunderstanding because this year I had a live pair against the foreign-aid bill. It is the first time in my 18 years in the Senate that I have voted against a foreign-aid bill. I am in favor of a good and economically sound foreign-aid bill; but in my judgment those criteria were not met by the foreign-aid bill this year. In my judgment the bill this year authorized the expenditure of many millions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money for purposes which represented waste.

So the record is clear that I urged postponement of consideration of the foreign-aid bill until we could first dispose of our own appropriation or money bills, and until we could dispose of the foreign trade bill, and until we could dispose of the legislation which involves our domestic problems. In my judgment we should take care of America's domestic problems first, and then turn our attention to foreign-aid problems. I said then, and I repeat now, that we put the cart before the horse. I know very well why it was done. The State Department was eager to have the question determined, so there could not be a reversal before the time of adjournment, just as the witnesses for the State Department this morning indicated that again it is seeking to "gallop through" the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate some more foreign-expenditure authorization bills. Consideration of such proposals should be postponed until January; we can then take the time to look at them, study them, and ponder and deliberate on them. But that is not possible now, under the rush act that characterizes the closing days of any session of Congress.

The rush act is now on to the 7th degree. As I said earlier today, I will do what I can to apply the brakes and to slow up the mad rush for the passage of bills in the closing days of the session without due deliberation. The American taxpayers are entitled to that service, and I intend to do what I can to give it to them.

Earlier today I said that again this morning the State Department's witnesses—as they have been prone to do in the past—were arguing that we should have a new embassy here and a new chancery there, around the world, because the French, the British, the Russians, and other governments are in the process of building chanceries and embassies more beautiful or more commodious than ours. Again, my question is, "So what?" The practice of economy would be a rather good example for the United States to set.

In connection with some of our allies and some of the underdeveloped countries of the world—which, interestingly enough, are building embassies and chanceries which, in my judgment, cannot be reconciled with sound economy on the part of their own treasuries—I point out that you and I, Madam President, symbolic of the taxpayers of the United States, are directly and indirectly supplying the money for many of those chanceries and embassies. In short, we are competing with our own American dollars in the competitive race abroad to "keep up with the Joneses." Let us not forget that the national debt of the United States is many millions of dollars greater than the combined national debts of all the other free nations of the world. Once that vital statistic sinks into the consciousness of the American taxpayers, the politicians in the Congress will be asked for a political accounting, which is long overdue.

I have waged this battle on the floor of the Senate since 1947, when I first offered my proposals for tax reform. I have battled ever since 1947 for tax reform, but I have been bumping my head against the stone wall of indifference in the Congress. But the American people are beginning to understand the symbolism of the battle which a few of us have been waging since 1947. I think the American taxpayers will make clear to the politicians that they have had enough, and that they think it is time for the politicians to start doing something about protecting our own economy and protecting and helping the taxpayers in the plight in which they find themselves.

A few years ago I sought to increase the exemption under the Federal income tax, for those in the low-income brackets, from \$600 to \$1,000. I was defeated in that attempt—which was not a new experience for me in the Senate, because I well understand the importance of having liberals at least challenge proposed legislation which cannot be defended on its merits, even though we may be overridden by powerful political forces in the Congress. Finally a vote was reached—not on my proposal to increase the exemption to \$1,000; I could not succeed in having it voted on—but on my

subsequent proposal to increase the exemption from \$600 to \$800. Again, I was defeated. However, time subsequently proved that I was right, both in regard to my proposal to increase the exemption to \$1,000 and in regard to my subsequent proposal to increase the exemption to \$800.

As I said earlier today, I think now is the time for tax reduction. I do not think the U.S. taxpayers should have to wait until January for some undetermined tax reduction program, insofar as its specifics are concerned, to be presented to the Congress some time after January by the President of the United States. I think the President should offer a tax reduction program now. If he does not offer it before Congress adjourns, I think he should promise the American people that Congress will reconvene in the week immediately following the election, and will then take up the tax issue and also some other issues which are of great importance to the American taxpayers.

Again I raise my voice in the plea that the Government take steps, either now or immediately following the election, to do a better job of protecting our economy, which is our greatest defense weapon.

In view of the announcement yesterday that our national debt is now more than \$300 billion, when we realize that the combined national debts of all the other free nations of the world are somewhere in the neighborhood of \$204 billion, or \$96 billion less than the total national debt of the United States, we had better stop, look, listen, and ask the question, Where are we going in connection with vast expenditures abroad? This is a proper question, particularly when we know that the good economic condition of many of our allies—far better than it was before World War II—is due to the largesse of the American people, through their Government, in fulfilling a clear moral obligation which we owed our allies, in order to protect them from the danger of being overriden by communism following World War II.

We have fulfilled that obligation, and we now need to take a look at the economic needs of our American taxpayers. We have a right to make clear to France, West Germany, England, Italy, Portugal, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and a good many of our other allies that the time has come for them to assume a greater share of the financial burden of protecting freedom around the world.

The American people have a right to ask the question of the politicians in Congress, "When, oh, when, are you going to take a course of action on monetary matters in the Congress that will protect our best economic interests?"

When I consider the great economic needs of the American people, when I take a look at the problems of slum clearance that confront the public, and the housing needs of millions of fellow Americans in the low-income brackets, I must say to the State Department, "You do not move me when you come before the Foreign Relations Commit-

tee, as you did this morning, and ask for funds to build luxurious embassies and chanceries in various places around the world."

We have an opportunity to demonstrate to the other nations of the world the meaning of the word "economy." It is long past time for us to economize in some of our expenditures abroad. We should use our money not only in connection with reducing our national debt, but in connection with meeting some of the dire emergency needs of millions of American people right here at home.

I intend to do what I can to focus the attention of the American people on our own domestic problems in connection with appropriation bills. I hope the Appropriations Committee, when it makes its reports to the Senate in the dying days of the present session, will be able to demonstrate to us that they have cut our foreign expenditures to the bone. I know what the lobbies are doing. Some of the lobbyists want more and more money to go into foreign aid, because they find they can make profits out of foreign aid expenditures abroad. Interestingly enough, much of the money made in that way is tax exempt. The way expenditures abroad are manipulated, they constitute a tax dodge for many companies. They get it both ways. Leave it to the lobbies to figure out ways and means to profit. There is only one way to handle the problem, that is to cut to the bone every dollar of expenditure abroad, and return in January for a complete reevaluation and reappraisal of our expenditures abroad. We should start taking care of some of our own domestic needs. Senators know very well what I mean when I speak of our own domestic needs. Not only do I speak of the needs of slum clearance and a crash housing program, but the development and conservation of our natural resources for the benefit of future generations of American boys and girls. Many of God's gifts of natural resources are in a deplorable plight because of inaction on the part of the Government.

It seems easy to put through Congress a bill to authorize, and then a bill to appropriate money for the building abroad of roads, dams, schools, and many other things which are sorely needed at home, and for which we cannot have funds appropriated. We seem to be able to appropriate funds for building such facilities abroad.

The Senator from Oregon does not take the position that a reasonable foreign-aid program is not justified, but he does take the position that we have passed the time when the foreign-aid program should be predominantly a United States program, for all of our allies have the same stake in the preservation of freedom that the United States has. But so long as we are willing to foot the bill, so long as the Congress acts as a rubber stamp and goes along with proposals to foot the bill, we can be sure that England, France, West Germany, Italy, Portugal, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and other countries will let Uncle Sam do it.

I am satisfied that the American people are thinking about this problem as

they have never thought about it before. I am satisfied that increasing tens of thousands of taxpayers in this country are beginning to ask some very difficult questions for the politicians to answer, if they attempt to answer them in justification of their voting records in the Congress of the United States. The American people are beginning to understand that the only test of a politician is, after all, his voting record.

I would have the American people take a long look at the voting records of politicians. I would have the American people hold to political account candidates for office in respect to their voting records, and make perfectly clear to such candidates that the time has come for the politicians to protect the economy of this country. It is not going to be protected by the kind of legislation which was before the Foreign Relations Committee this morning. It is not going to be protected by the shocking waste that has honeycombed the foreign-aid bills already authorized. Therefore, the Appropriations Committee has a very great responsibility in the preparation of appropriation bills for the Senate between now and adjournment.

The Senator from Oregon never finds himself happy in such opposition as he has expressed again today to his administration; but in this instance his administration is as dead wrong as it was on the satellite bill the other day. The people of my State did not send me to the Senate to rubberstamp any administration, including the administration of my own party, if, in my judgment, after study, I am convinced that my administration is wrong on the facts. The responsibility I owe to my people is to follow where the facts lead. In my judgment the facts lead in an opposite direction from that of the administration on such issues as the satellite bill, the foreign aid bill, and the bills which came before the Foreign Relations Committee this morning.

Regardless of what political consequences may be in store for me in exercising my independent judgment, I intend to follow where the facts lead. If partisan politics are not going in the same direction, it is just too bad for partisan politics.

MILITARY SERVICE OF MEDICAL SCHOOL GRADUATES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, at the April meeting of the Association of Professors of Medicine, a great deal of time and thought was given to the present method of drafting recent graduates of medical school into the military service. A resolution was passed embodying the recommendations of the Association of Professors of Medicine.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this resolution appear in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSORS OF MEDICINE

The Association of Professors of Medicine, an organization comprised of the chairman

of departments of medicine of all accredited U.S. medical schools, recommends that:

1. Selective service increase liberally the number of young physicians who are deferred from military service for at least 1 additional year beyond internship. Such a policy will allow better medical care in the approved hospitals, better organization of postgraduate training in medicine and improved preparation of physicians for better general military practice.

This plan of an additional year of deferment beyond internship is not proposed to replace the existing Berry plan, which allows training of young physicians for specialty practice in the Armed Forces.

2. The induction date for military service for physicians should be on or about July 1 of each year, with at least 3 and preferably 6 months preinduction notification period.

3. Because of the important responsibility of its members in graduate medical education, the Association of Professors of Medicine should be represented on national advisory committees dealing with the distribution and utilization of the medical manpower of the Nation.

ENLISTED MAN'S ARMED FORCES OATH

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have received a copy of a resolution adopted recently by the Queens County chapter of the Catholic War Veterans and passed unanimously at their regular chapter delegates meeting on August 8. This resolution endorses H.R. 218, 87th Congress, as passed by the House, which would amend the existing Enlisted Man's Armed Forces Oath by adding the phrase, "to support and defend the Constitution of the United States of America," and a closing phrase, "so help me God."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY QUEENS COUNTY CHAPTER, CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS

RESOLUTION ENDORSING AMENDMENT TO THE ENLISTED MAN'S ARMED FORCES OATH

Whereas the current oath being administered to persons enlisting in the Armed Forces includes no obligation to support and defend the Constitution of the United States of America, and no opportunity to invoke the help of Almighty God in rendering faithful service in defense of the United States; and

Whereas the words "So help me God" are not a part of the obligation assumed upon taking the oath: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Queens County chapter of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, Inc., at a regular chapter delegates meeting, endorse H.R. 218, 87th Congress, as passed by the House which amends the existing law to include these important additions: "to support and defend the Constitution of the United States of America," and a closing phrase, "So help me God."

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12391) to improve and protect farm income, to reduce costs of farm programs to the Federal Government, to reduce the Federal Government's excessive stocks of agricultural

commodities, to maintain reasonable and stable prices of agricultural commodities and products to consumers, to provide adequate supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic and foreign needs, to conserve natural resources, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I send to the desk my amendment designated "8-20-62—F."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 56, between lines 2 and 3, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 305. (a) The Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out subsections (a) and (b) of section 105 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act, beginning with the 1964 crop, price support shall be made available to producers for each crop of corn at such level, not to exceed 90 percent of the parity price therefor, as the Secretary determines will not result in increasing Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of corn."

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to consult and advise with farmers, farm organizations, and such other persons or groups of persons as he determines concerning the need for new legislation for feed grains, to the extent he deems such consultation and advice necessary or desirable, and to make specific recommendations for feed grains in the form of proposed legislation which shall be submitted to the Congress as soon as practicable during the next session of Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, is there an amendment pending before the Senate at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana is pending.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, may we have a vote on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, this amendment would repeal the feed grain price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1958 and provide, instead, for support of the price of corn at such level, not exceeding 90 percent of parity, as will not result in any increase in CCC stocks. It would be effective beginning with the 1964 crop.

The 1958 act requires support for corn, with unlimited production, at 90 percent of the previous 3-year average price, but not less than 65 percent of parity. It also requires that the other feed grains be supported at levels fair and reasonable in relation to corn. My amendment would provide for corn price sup-

port at 0 to 90 percent of parity, and at a level within that range which will not result in further surplus accumulations by the Government. Support for the other feed grains would be discretionary at 0 to 90 percent of parity under title III of the 1949 act.

Madam President, although I am sorely disappointed, it appears to me that the Senate, like the House, is not now disposed to accept the very realistic and reasonable feed grain program that I have been advocating.

The feed grain program, which I had a large hand in devising, put it squarely up to farmers themselves as to whether they wished to accept strict controls or whether they preferred no controls. I might remind Senators that strict controls would not have gone into effect unless and until two-thirds of the farmers voted in favor of them.

S. 3225, as passed, was devised on the one hand to protect farmers if they so wished protection, and on the other hand to protect the Government whether farmers did or did not wish controls. The feed grain program would have provided for strict controls with high price supports or no controls and supports at a so-called free market price level. Farmers would have chosen which route they had wanted to go. The taxpayers of this country would have been protected in either case because the Government would not have been required to purchase and store huge quantities of feed grains which are not needed and cannot be used.

Senators will remember that the carrying charges on feed grains and wheat last year amounted to \$900 million. This is an astronomical sum and, in my opinion, it is money that need not be spent by this Government. Fiscal responsibility demands that this Senate protect the taxpayers of this country from the expenditure of huge sums which can be easily avoided.

I placed information in the RECORD which shows that the feed grains and wheat programs I proposed, and the Senate adopted on May 25, would have saved the taxpayers a billion dollars in 1963. Under that program, the Government would finally have been able to get out from under farm programs which have required the accumulation of huge stocks of agricultural commodities in Government hands.

I am a realist and I can see that a program such as I envisioned being placed on the statute books is not now acceptable. It is evident that the Congress refuses at this time to give farmers the chance to vote as to whether or not they wish strict controls.

Under these circumstances responsibility demands that some action be taken to protect the taxpayers from the further accumulation of excess stocks of feed grains. Unless some action is taken the program that will go into effect in 1964, and thereafter, will be the 1958 law under which farmers are guaranteed high price supports but have no responsibility whatsoever regarding production. In other words, farmers could produce as much as they wished and the Government would have to buy all that

would be produced in excess of market requirements. To me this is the height of fiscal irresponsibility. In my judgment this Congress must take some action in order to protect the taxpayers who, in my estimation, carry a heavy enough load as it is.

In early 1961 we enacted a so-called emergency program for feed grains to be effective for 1961, under which farmers were paid for not producing. Later on this Congress extended the so-called temporary feed grain program for 1962.

At the end of the first full year's operation of the emergency feed grain program estimates indicate that the carryover of feed grains has been reduced by about 12 million tons. If the same conditions prevail this year, the carryover will be reduced by another 12 million tons in 1962. While this is a noteworthy achievement, I feel that the total carryover stocks, which I estimate at this time to be about 61 million tons at the end of 1962, is still too high, particularly in view of the fact that most of these stocks will be owned by the Government.

Therefore, in view of the fact that this Congress refuses to give farmers a choice as to whether or not they wish strict controls, I am proposing first, that the so-called emergency feed grain program be extended again through 1963. If conditions remain similar to this year's, carryover stocks at the end of the 1963 marketing year will be about 49.6 million tons. This level is only slightly higher than the carryover in 1956, which amounted to 48.8 million tons, and is more in keeping with our carryover requirements.

While Government expenditures under the emergency feed grain program will be higher than under the program I had previously advocated, there will still be less than if the 1958 act were again to become operative.

Second, in conjunction with the extension of the emergency program for 1963, I am also proposing that for 1964 and thereafter farmers be given the complete freedom which apparently this Congress wants them to have. At the same time, I am assuring that this Government will be protected from the drain on tax dollars which we need so desperately in other areas.

I am also proposing that Government price supports for feed grains be set at between 0 and 90 percent of parity, assuring that the Government will not have to take over excess supplies. I do this in order to protect the Government from the expenditures of unnecessary dollars spent in purchasing feed grains as it has done in past years. Under this program farmers will have complete freedom to plant as they wish and to sell as they wish except that sales to the Government would be minimized.

This Government has spent billions of dollars in supporting the price of feed grains in the past years and I do not propose that this Government shall continue to expend such huge sums. In my estimation it would have been much preferable had this Congress seen fit to give farmers a choice as to whether or not they wish to accept strict controls

with high price supports or no controls with low price supports.

In refusing to give farmers a choice, it appears that the only alternative left is discretionary supports. At the same time, I want to assure the taxpayers of this Nation that they are protected fully in that the Government will not have to purchase surpluses produced in excess of our needs. It appears to me that this is the only alternative left for this Government to take. That is to protect itself in the face of unlimited production.

Mr. HART. Madam President, I call up my amendment "8-20-62-E" and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Michigan will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 94, between lines 12 and 13 it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 404. The Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is further amended as follows: Section 8c(6) is amended by striking the period at the end of (I) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That with respect to orders applicable to cherries such projects may provide for any form of marketing promotion including paid advertising."

On page 94, line 13, strike out "404" and insert in lieu thereof "405".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan was agreed to unanimously by the Senate when the bill (S. 3225) was considered by the Senate in May. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] I send to the desk an amendment which was also agreed to unanimously by the Senate when S. 3225 was before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 91, line 21, it is proposed to strike out the word "and".

On page 91, line 24, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and".

On page 91, between lines 24 and 25, it is proposed to insert the following:

(5) By adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"Sec. 343. As used in this title (1) the term 'farmers' shall be deemed to include persons who are engaged in, or who, with assistance afforded under this title, intend to engage in, fish farming, and (2) the term 'farming' shall be deemed to include fish farming."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, last month I offered an amendment that would restore to the bill a provision contained in the House bill relating to the support price for corn in 1964. The amendment was designated as "8-3-62—A." I offered the amendment because if the bill as reported to the Senate had been passed, after 1964 the support price for corn would be cut back to about 54 percent of parity based upon the 80 percent of the 3 previous years. We know that the support price for corn has been very expensive. It has reduced the consumption of corn. The total utilization of corn increased 1,112 million bushels in the 5 years since 1956, whereas it declined 48 million bushels in the 6 years from 1950 to 1956.

However, the Senate has just agreed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], which would repeal the 1958 act with respect to feed grains. The support price of feed grains under that act, as I recall, would be higher than under the present emergency act. We would go back to the 1958 situation when there were no controls whatever. It would be a more expensive program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes. The 1958 act provided for unlimited production with a guaranteed price support.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. President, I sent to the desk in July an amendment relating to wheat, designated "7-23-62—A." I call up that amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, at the end of subtitle B of title III of the bill, it is proposed to add a new section as follows:

SEC. . Section 333 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended effective with the 1964 crop of wheat by striking therefrom the following: "The national acreage allotment for wheat for any year shall be not less than fifty-five million acres."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the farm bill of 1949, to which I referred yesterday, was what we called a continuation of the rigid support price program. It required a 75-percent support price for wheat. Later we fixed the minimum acreage of wheat at 55 million acres.

As I pointed out yesterday, in recent years the per acre production has been more than twice what it was when the acreage was fixed at 55 million acres.

The program has been very expensive. The use of wheat for feed has declined from 150 million bushels a year to less than 50 million.

We have been exporting wheat under the provisions of Public Law 480. The Senator from Louisiana has said that that program has cost us almost \$7 billion in soft currency for surpluses. Then we financed the export of wheat with sound money at 65 cents a bushel. We have given away abroad some of the soft currency received in the exportation

of wheat. The CCC has a total of \$2,124 million invested in wheat and loans outstanding in the amount of \$392 million.

I should like to state what my amendment would do. After 1963 there would be no minimum wheat acreage at all. If there is a support price, the Secretary of Agriculture would fix the acreage so that the program would not be as expensive as it has been in the past. The distinguished chairman of the committee, in handling the bill on the floor of the Senate, told me yesterday that he did not personally have any objection to my amendment, because it would be a move in the direction of reduced costs of the uncontrollable surplus which we have had in the past, and also would return our farmers to a program of private enterprise. We know that when we were not placing one red cent of subsidy behind the wheat farmers, they not only produced enough wheat to feed our Nation, but also exported about 20 percent of what they produced. Each year wheat was exported abroad for sound money. Now we export none of it for sound money. We subsidize wheat at 65 cents a bushel. In effect we are giving away a great deal of it and still have on hand more than we know what to do with. The distinguished chairman said that the Senate would not agree to my amendment. I cannot be too sure that the Senate will. I offer the amendment and ask for a vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hesitate to oppose my good friend from Virginia on this amendment. We have a wheat section which will have almost the same effect. The Senator's amendment is more or less in conflict with the wheat provision which the committee adopted. Under the wheat provision contained in the bill, the minimum amount of wheat to be produced per year will be a billion bushels. By the adoption of the wheat amendment as incorporated in the bill it will accomplish about the same thing that the amendment of the Senator from Virginia would accomplish. I compliment him on presenting the amendment, which almost fits in with the provision we now have in the bill. I can assure the Senator that the language in the bill will accomplish what he is seeking to do with his amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am gratified that we are making some move toward saving some money, whether by my amendment or by what is in the bill. I am glad that we are headed for some improvement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I have just come in. I understand that an amendment was adopted a few minutes ago without a roll-call which would have the effect of repealing the support prices for corn under

the 1958 act, which is the law now in effect, and substituting supports for corn at 0 to 90 percent of parity. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment which has been adopted would repeal that part of the 1958 act which fixes a support price at 90 percent for the last 3 years average or 65 percent of parity, whichever is higher, and in lieu of that we have provided support prices from 0 to 90 percent.

Mr. COOPER. May I ask what the purpose of the amendment is? What is the Senator seeking to accomplish by the amendment? I ask the question for clarification.

Mr. ELLENDER. We have in the bill now, adopted by the committee, a continuation of the emergency program for one more year, and at the end of that emergency there would be no price support for corn except from 0 to 90 percent, and production, of course, under that provision would be unlimited.

Mr. COOPER. That would become effective in 1964?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I know the purpose of the chairman, as he made very clear yesterday on the floor, is to secure, if possible, enactment next year of a compulsory feed grain program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. What the chairman of the committee desires to do, and many Members of the Senate desire to do, is to repeal the law which today allows unlimited production in corn and other feed grains and sorghums and barley, without any limitation as to the acreage.

Mr. COOPER. I do not believe the chairman would intend it, but does he anticipate or foresee that the Secretary of Agriculture would have the power—if he desire to use it—to fix the support price on corn, under his amendment permitting support from 0 to 90 percent, at such a low figure that would have the effect of forcing farmers to adopt the compulsory feed grain program?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I would not.

Mr. COOPER. Does the chairman expect that to happen?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not expect that at all, for the reason that in fixing the support price the Secretary will have the authority to fix it at not to exceed the 90 percent of parity price therefor as the Secretary determines will not result in increasing the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of corn. In other words, that is the goal that he must reach. Any price support that he fixes must not result in an increase of the surplus of corn.

Mr. COOPER. I will explain my reason for asking the question. The Senator knows that many of us do not support a compulsory feed grain control program. For, as the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] said yesterday, we do not know what the situation will be a year from now, or 2 years from now, with respect to supplies of feed grain.

Whatever their volume or value may be then, it is a fact that from the standpoint of use, present stocks of feed grains represent about a 5-month supply or possibly 6-month supply. Beyond

that fact, many of us have thought that to pass a compulsory feed grain control bill, which might deny farmers the right to raise feed for the livestock on their own farms, would be a radical departure in farm legislation.

We have considered that it might be much better to have a feed grain program under which the Government would continue to make some payments to farmers, rather than to place every crop in the United States under Federal controls. I do not want to see that happen.

I believe there are some in the Department of Agriculture, according to the testimony we heard this year and last year, who want to place every crop in this country under some kind of Federal controls—and ultimately, over livestock. This viewpoint came out clearly in hearings before the Senate Committee on Agriculture in 1961.

The question I ask about this amendment—and I know the chairman will speak clearly about it—is whether he believes that the Secretary of Agriculture or his Department would use the power of setting feed grain supports between 0 and 90 percent of parity to lower supports, so that it would have the effect of forcing farmers to vote for a compulsory control program because there would be no workable alternative to protect them in any way except such a control program.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I do not believe that at all. To begin with, the machinery to bring anything like that about is not available. The Secretary would have no right under the law or under any past laws to put acreage controls into effect. That is what the Senator is interested in.

Mr. COOPER. I believe the Senator has expressed his view.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Secretary could fix the price support at 5 percent of parity or 80 percent of parity, but he cannot put acreage controls into effect.

Mr. COOPER. If the Secretary fixed feed grain supports at 5 percent, and as a result a flood of feed grains was produced, the price would drop, and the situation that would develop might force the farmers to take something they do not want.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows that the only time the Secretary of Agriculture would be called upon to do that would be to assist in raising the price of the crop. However, I go back to the proposition that by the adoption of this amendment the Secretary of Agriculture would have no right whatever in any manner to control the production of corn or other feed grains, or limiting acres.

Mr. COOPER. If the time comes when farmers have to vote upon the compulsory feed grain control proposal, I would like to know a workable alternative is preserved in the basic law. In 1958, when the farm bill was before us that year, much of it marked a radical departure, in the sense that it departed from the old parity concept. At that time the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] offered an amendment, which maintained the parity concept, to provide a feed grain program under

which each farmer could choose to expand his acreage at a somewhat lower level of supports. I voted for it. His amendment was defeated, but at least it offered farmers a choice. The bill which was passed in 1958 provided for a referendum to continue corn allotments with 75 to 90 percent support for cooperators, or to abandon corn allotments and provide supports for all corn at 90 percent of the 3-year market price or 65 percent of parity, whichever was higher. As a result, of the 1958 act, corn allotments with 75 percent supports were defeated in the referendum, and that helped to produce the present surpluses.

I should like to see something provided on the order of the proposal of the Senator from Minnesota in 1958. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has said that the 0 to 90 percent of parity would give some protection to corn growers. I am not so sure. I know the Senator from Louisiana is sincere, but I do not favor giving this authority to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understood the chairman to say yesterday that it will be his intention in January to call the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry into session for the purpose of obtaining testimony from persons engaged in the feed and grain business and also from the Department of Justice in order to perfect a new feed grain program. As I understand, the bill before us is at best a stopgap measure. The Senator from Louisiana expects Congress to take affirmative action next year. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what the proposal would lead to. I am hopeful that it will be possible to hold hearings not only on corn, but also dairying during the early part of next year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Section (b) of the Senator's amendment provides for that very thing.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Kentucky as I make some comments.

I have heard from the wheatgrowers and the livestock and poultry feeders of my section of the country, which encompasses Idaho, Washington, and Oregon. They are pointing out that based on the Kansas City market, for example, and eliminating the freight differential, which is always a handicap to us, feed grain in the Pacific Northwest is costing them from \$7 to \$10 a ton more than it costs in Kansas City, and that this is bound to exterminate many feeders in the Northwest. They cannot wait until the next session of Congress.

I believe they are trying to solve this problem with the help of the Secretary of Agriculture, in the hope that some relief can be provided. Much milo and other feed grains should go to the Pacific Northwest, but the storage people are doing everything they can to block its movement. I did not know that the objective of the farm program was to enable the storage people to make profits. I thought the objective was to dispose of surplus grain. There is a great need

for surplus grain in the Pacific Northwest. It is all tied up with this version of the bill, so the wheatgrowers and feeders of my section of the country have told me in the last 24 hours. So I wish to lay this problem before the Senate, make the legislative history, and get the comments of any Senator who wishes to make the legislative history, particularly the Senator from Louisiana.

The wheatgrowers and feeders in my section of the country say, "Well, a large amount of barley, which has been cut out of the program, is being exported." It surely is. We ought to be praised for that. It is desirable to export barley. But if we were not exporting barley, our feeders could not buy barley, because they could not afford to buy it at support prices. So that, again, would help the storage people.

The suggestion has been made to me in the last 24 hours that I elicit from the Senator from Louisiana a legislative history on this phase of the wheat program, for it appears now that there will not be an adequate control system provision in the bill. There is to be a wheat program which will be better than nothing, but far short of the two-price wheat program, as to which the Senator from Louisiana has done a masterful job, and for which we in the Pacific Northwest are indebted to him. I think it is perfectly clear from the record that if he had his way now, he would stand just where he has been standing with respect to this question; but he has an almost impossible task, as the manager of the bill, to have some measure passed by the Senate which will at least provide some protection to agriculture.

But the wheatgrowers in my region are asking me why it is not possible to include in the bill a provision, or at least to make a legislative history, which would permit the practice that I now describe; namely, of permitting that amount of wheat acreage that goes out of production, so far as feed wheat and export wheat are concerned, to be planted, with no supports, in feed grain, so as to help make available in our part of the country a supply of feed grain for the feeders of both livestock and poultry. I ask the Senator from Louisiana: Is such a suggestion at all reasonable?

I see no reason why acreage should be permitted to be planted in barley on the assumption that it will be used for feed grain, when actually it will not be used for feed grain, because it will be exported or placed in storage, since the support price makes it too expensive to be used as feed grain in my part of the country in competition with feed grain marketed at Kansas City and other midwest cities at from \$7 to \$10 a ton cheaper than our feeders can buy their grain.

If some of the acres in our section of the country that are not to be covered by support prices could be planted in wheat to be used as feed, that might be of some help. I do not know whether it will solve the problem at all, but I am grasping at straws to be of help to the feeders of my section of the country, because the evidence we have filed with the Department of Agriculture is, in my judgment, unanswerable. It is evidence provided by research studies made by

Oregon State University, at Corvallis, and by Washington State College. They are impartial studies prepared by men who know the grain business of the Pacific Northwest, and they bear out what I have said in my statement this morning; namely, that the feeders in the Northwest cannot compete with the feeders of the Middle West because of the differential in the price of grain. The answer is not to be found in the freight differential, because that even compounds their problem.

So I ask the chairman of the committee: What would be wrong with allowing some of the acreage that is to be taken out of production to be planted in wheat, but only for feed grain use?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, I am very sympathetic to the problem which the Senator has laid before the Senate. In order to be of assistance, as he remembers, when we included the compulsory feed grain provision, we had a section which provided an interchange between corn and wheat that could be used for feed. Unfortunately, since we were unable to pass the original title pertaining to corn and other feed grains—that is, to make them compulsory—that provision was stricken from the bill. I regret that very much. But I want to give the Senator from Oregon assurance that in the amendment which was adopted we are providing some relief, for in it there is a section which invites those in the position the Senator from Oregon has described to contact the Department of Agriculture, in the hope that some remedial legislation can be enacted come January.

I wish to give my assurance that I shall do all I can to alleviate the situation the Senator from Oregon complains about. Of course he realizes that our great difficulty at the moment is that we have so much wheat in surplus now, and also so much of feed grains, that to permit the planting of more in another section of the country might do violence to the program.

As I have said, I am very sympathetic with what the Senator from Oregon is suggesting; and, come January, I am very hopeful of being able to present to the Senate a bill which may correct the situation about which the Senator from Oregon complains.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this relief just means economic survival for the feeders in the Pacific Northwest. I cannot justify not doing everything I can at this session to try to provide them with some relief. If the acres I am talking about are allowed to be planted to non-support wheat, it does not seem to me that will increase our wheat surplus, because the support price could not be used for that wheat. It would be economically impossible for the support price to be used for it, because they could not get their money back. But without this relief, they will have to go out of the feed business.

The situation in the Pacific Northwest is that the feeders are being shipped into the Midwest, where the price of grain is low, because we cannot get the relief to which we believe we are entitled.

We are accustomed to being an economic colony of the East and the Midwest; we have had that experience for decades and decades. But the people of my part of the country want an emancipation proclamation by means of this part of the bill. We are fed up with being economic colonists of the Midwest and the East. We want our economic independence; and we think we should be allowed on an economic basis to raise our own feed, to be fed to our own feeders, for consumption in our own section of the country. We can raise the meat that is needed for the west coast. But what is happening? Meat is being imported, to feed the people in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and California; and much of that meat is in the form of our finished feeders, which have been sent to the Midwest feeding lots, because this unjustifiable economic discrimination against my section of the country is permitted to continue.

I am fighting here today to get an emancipation proclamation insofar as our farmers are concerned, so they no longer will be the economic colonists of the Midwest and the East. I do not understand why Congress insists upon imposing this kind of economic injustice upon my section of the country. I do not see why the people of California, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho have to ship their feeders to the Midwest, to be fattened and slaughtered, and then shipped back to the west coast, to provide a meat supply for the people of our section of the country, when we have in our section of the country the greatest herds in the country. This simply is not right or just.

If we can say to the feeders and to the wheat growers of my section of the country, "Here are so many thousands of acres of wheatland which do not fall within the wheat program. You cannot get the support price for wheat grown on them; but if you want to grow wheat on them, instead of growing something else on them or instead of letting them lie barren and take a soil bank payment for them, we will let you raise your own feed grains on them. You will not get any support money for it, but you can use the wheat to feed to your own feeders," what could possibly be wrong with that, unless we wish to say that as a matter of policy we are going to penalize the Pacific Northwest. But, Mr. President, that cannot be justified. That injustice has been too long endured by the people of my section of the country.

I want to work with this administration, and I want to help this administration pass sound legislation. But I am not going to sit here and support this administration in the perpetuation of economic injustice against the people of Oregon. I simply am not going to do it; and I think this is a place where justice can be worked out, and I think the feeders of Oregon are entitled to an arrangement which will assure them a supply of feed grains to be used in the Oregon feed lots, without having to pay \$7 to \$10 a ton more than feeders in Iowa, Illinois, Kansas, and the feeding lot areas in that part of the country have

to pay. So I am pleading for only simple justice.

We have been trying to work out with the Department of Agriculture an arrangement by means of which it will release some of the great quantities of milo in the Midwest storage bins, to help produce the needed supply of meat. But we are told that the storage people would raise holy Ned if such a program were followed.

So today I ask, here on the floor of the Senate, whom are we trying to help? The farmers or the storage profiteers? I should think we would have had our belly full—and I am sorry to use that phrase, but it is so descriptive and so apropos that I do use it—of storage scandals. I should think the Sol Estes case would be enough. The reason why such a scandal developed is that the Government has been aiding the storage people, not the farmers. I want to get this feed out of storage and into human stomachs and into the stomachs of livestock and poultry, so that, in turn, there can be a meat supply for human consumption. I also wish to point out that I do not think we have yet scratched the surface of the export market, insofar as the export of meat is concerned.

So there simply cannot be any justification for keeping the grain in storage, where much of it will spoil. Certainly a study needs to be made of the spoilage which occurs in connection with the Government's storage program. It should not be allowed to spoil in the Government storage bins. It should go into empty human stomachs around the world; and it should also be made available to farmers in parts of the country, such as the Pacific Northwest, which are being economically discriminated against because they are not allowed to compete on an "equal shake" basis with the feeders in the Midwest.

That is the problem. All I can do is raise it here. There is no question about the soundness of the facts on which I rely, because the conclusions reached in the studies by the agricultural departments of Oregon and Washington, to which I have referred today, have not been answered by the Department of Agriculture, and cannot be answered by the Department of Agriculture, because 2 plus 2 still makes 4, no matter what kind of rationalization the Department of Agriculture wishes to give for a continuance of this discriminatory policy.

I think the Senator from Louisiana knows how appreciative I am of the agricultural statesmanship he demonstrates every time we have an agricultural bill before us. But I would be less than honest if I did not say that many of the feeders in Oregon cannot wait until January; by January, many of them will be dead broke and out of business. Now is the time for this administration to write into this bill some protection which will give Oregon feeders an equal competitive "break" with feeders in the Midwest. We are not asking for more; but we are asking for that. Until that is done, in my judgment the Oregon feeders will remain the economic colonists of the feeders in the Midwest

and the East; and that cannot be justified.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, "8-20-62-D."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota to the committee amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 49, beginning in line 1, after the period, to strike out all through line 5.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, this is the appropriate time to call up the amendment since the Senate has just adopted an amendment which would repeal the 1958 act placing a minimum price support on corn at 65 percent of parity.

It has been very difficult for me to be on the floor during the consideration of this farm bill. All day the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture has been taking final action on the agriculture appropriation bill, and I am the ranking Republican member of that committee, so I feel I must be there. But the amendment I am calling up would repeal this provision in the present law, a provision that was put in the law about 2 years ago, which reads as follows:

Price support for corn, grain sorghums, and barley shall be made available on not to exceed the normal production of the 1963 acreage of corn, grain sorghums, and barley of each eligible farm based on its average yield per acre for the 1959 and 1960 crop acreage.

Previous to that provision, the program provided price supports on feed grains and other grains on the amount actually produced by the farmer. This language provides the farmer can receive price supports on only his average production of the previous 2 years.

Let me illustrate how it works in my State. Last year we had a severe drought. In much of the area there was practically no crop at all. Thus the average yield was greatly reduced. This year we have a good crop. So the farmers find themselves able to get price supports on only about half of their feed grain production. They feel it is unfair. I believe it is unfair. It is particularly unfair since price supports have been reduced from 65 to 90 percent of parity to 0 to 90 percent of parity under an amendment just approved by the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there is a good deal of merit to what the Senator from North Dakota has said. Since the provision that his amendment strikes from the committee amendment is in the House bill, the provision will be in conference, and I am willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in order to bring about the appropriate parliamentary situation, I move to reconsider the votes on all amendments to the committee amendment which have

been agreed to. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc for purposes of reconsideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all amendments will be reconsidered en bloc.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky reserves the right to object.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, earlier I questioned the amendment which has been voted on, to change price supports for feed grains from 65 percent of parity to a new standard of 0 to 90 percent of parity. I would like to have the vote on that amendment reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes on all other amendments to the committee amendment, which have been agreed to, except the Ellender amendment on page 56, after line 2, be reconsidered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table. The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the Ellender amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I withhold my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator. I recognize the amendment was agreed to. I was not here at the time, and very few Senators were here. There was no debate on the amendment, which was not available until today, and no rollcall.

I raised questions regarding the amendment, as soon as I heard the amendment was passed by voice vote and they appear to me to have some importance. I oppose the compulsory feed grain control program, for these reasons:

First, I do not think there is any need for it. There are no great supplies on hand, from the standpoint of the volume of feed grain used each year—5 or 6 month's supplies. Second, the control program would deny some farmers the right to raise feed grains on their own land to feed their stock which would be a radical departure. Third, the control program could lead to controls over livestock production. It might not happen, but raises that possibility.

If the compulsory feed grain program becomes law, it would mean that practically every farm crop would be under some type of Government control, and every farmer engaged in a Government farm program.

I know there will be time during the next year to consider a revised feed grain program. I know I do not have to tell the chairman of the committee of my high regard for him, for his thoroughness and fairness. I hope he

will hold three or four hearings or more over the country, as was done in 1947, to ascertain the views of farmers, and to determine if there is some way of meeting the feed grain problem other than by the compulsory program which the Department of Agriculture desires, and something better than the present program. I want to see a change in the present program, but we cannot assume that farmers and farm organizations over the country have no ideas on the problem.

What has all this to do with my motion that the vote on the amendment be reconsidered? What I have said is relevant, for I believe the authority to fix price supports at from 0 to 90 percent provided to the Secretary of Agriculture by the amendment, could give him the power—in fact require him—to fix price supports at such a low figure, that it would have the effect of forcing the farmers to take a program they did not want. For the amendment provides that he must fix supports—0 to 90 percent—at such a figure as would not increase CCC stocks. This would force him to lower supports radically. I do not think my argument is technical; I think it is fundamental.

The Secretary is firmly wedded to compulsory programs. I know Mr. Willard Cochrane, his assistant, who came with him to our committee, is firmly wedded to compulsory control programs. They so testified. The amendment, authorizing price supports at 0 to 90 percent, accompanied by the provision that such price support level must not add to stocks, would require the Secretary and others who are wedded to the idea of a compulsory feed grain program, to fix price supports at such a low level that the farmers might be forced to vote for a compulsory feed grain program.

I think, in all fairness to the farmers, we should take the possibility I have mentioned into account.

I am afraid the Senate will take this amendment. It has already taken it. I am not complaining. No quorum was called on it following the quorum on taking up the farm bill. I understand there was no debate on the amendment, and no rollcall vote. But, if the vote is reconsidered—and I would like to have it reconsidered—I want to be recorded as voting against the amendment for the reasons I have given, and give other Senators the same chance. Then, if the Senate wants to approve the amendment, it will be the Senate's judgment.

I move to reconsider.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am going to withdraw the motion to reconsider. Before I do so, in order that we may accommodate Senators who wish to make some comment, I withhold. Other Senators are interested. I shall withdraw the motion.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am not particularly worried about how to control surpluses of feed grains 2 or 3 years from now. What concerns me most is whether we shall have enough feed grain production in the country to meet the demand both here and abroad. The demand for feed grains is growing by leaps and bounds. People all over the

world are demanding finished beef now, and that requires feed grains. Our own population is increasing at the rate of nearly 3 million people a year.

To show the position we are in at the present time I should like to put a few figures in the Record. I shall take corn as an example, and the USDA figures as authority for what I shall say.

In 1961 we fed and sold, according to the revised figures of the Department, 3,983 million bushels of corn. In the same year of 1961 we produced 3,624 million bushels of corn. The carryover at the end of the marketing year was 350 million bushels less than the carryover the year before.

Approximately 100 million bushels of the decrease was brought about by the billion dollar emergency program, and 250 million bushels of the reduction resulted from increased sales and feeding of feed grains.

The marketing and feeding of corn for the year 1962 is expected to be far in excess of 1961. I believe I heard on the radio this morning that the Department estimates 2½ million more tons will be fed this year than were fed last year.

According to the statistics, there are 4 percent more cattle on feed now than there were a year ago, and we are feeding at a 10 percent higher rate than we were 5 years ago. That is going to take a lot of feed grains.

The carryover for October 1 of this year is estimated at 1,650 million bushels, or slightly over a 4 months' supply, figuring at the rate of feeding which prevailed last year. We are now using feed grains in this country at a rate in excess of our total production for the record years of 1959 and 1960.

So it does not seem to me that we need worry too much about surpluses of feed grains. In 2 or 3 years we may be worrying about having enough feed grains to meet our own requirements and the demand for export.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, again I give reassurance to my good friend from Kentucky that before offering the amendment I had the law examined. The Secretary of Agriculture will be unable to provide any program of any kind of controls on the production of corn and other feed grains. The 0 to 90 percent provision may be used by the Secretary to encourage production. He will not have to do so but the provision may be used to encourage the production of corn and other feed grains, as is done in the case of soybeans and other commodities which may be in shortage. That is the provision in the law now, I say to my good friend.

In my amendment I have provided that the same price supports procedure may be invoked for corn as for many other commodities. It can be used, as I said, in the event we need more production.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my motion to reconsider may be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, as the chairman of the committee knows quite well, I have absolute confidence in anything the chairman tells us, as have all the members of the committee. All of us on the committee know of his absolute fairness in all these matters.

The chairman knows that when the farm bill was first before the committee, and before the Senate earlier in the year, and again when the bill as passed by the House was last before the committee, I supported that part of the bill which would revise the wheat allotment program, because wheat has been the most troublesome and persistent surplus. Also, a distinction can be made between wheat—a crop susceptible to rigid controls, and which has had a control program for many years—and feed grains.

I feel so strongly about the compulsory feed grains program that I do not want to see any action taken now which could give the Department of Agriculture a power, such as the 0 to 90 percent support price, which at some time—next year, or the year after that—would be used, in fact, required to be used, and which would have a coercive effect in bringing about the adoption of a compulsory feed grains program.

I know the chairman does not have anything like that in mind. But last year and again this year the Secretary of Agriculture and his advisers came before our committee and expressed the view that the compulsory feed grains program must be adopted as a permanent program. Of course, when the committee refused to adopt it, they had the question taken to the Senate, and by a very small majority of 42 to 38 it was adopted by the Senate. I assume the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary and his advisers, are not going to relinquish their effort to secure a compulsory feed grains program.

I do not accept the view, because they offer it, that it is a "must" program. The subject of agriculture is a kind of mystery to many people. The chairman knows farm programs, along with the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. But the lack of knowledge of farm programs is general throughout the country, and I say, with all respect, this mystery, lack of understanding, is reflected in newspaper editorials. Many take the position that the feed grains program ought to be adopted as a part of the administration program, without recognizing that it has much deeper consequences and significance. Many do not know that it would lead to controls at some time upon livestock and poultry, that it would mean that many farmers would be prohibited from growing feed for use on their own farms, and that it would lead to a control over crops and farmers that this country has never known. Wheat, cotton, tobacco are different. Feed grains are inherent in the farmers' use of his farm.

I should like to see at least some segment of the farmers remain free from governmental controls and governmental support.

I do not want to be overly suspicious. Its effect could force enactment of a compulsory feed grain control program if such a program were enacted.

So, I move to reconsider the vote. I shall ask for a quorum call, so that the Senate can vote on whether the support price for the 1964 crop and subsequent crops of corn shall be changed from 65 percent of parity to some point to be determined by the Secretary between 0 and 90 percent of parity.

Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will have to obtain unanimous consent in order to make such a motion. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent for that purpose?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, of course, I could have objected but I did not want to do so. I am for free debate. I do not wish to be accused of trying to "put something over" on Senators. But I assure my good friend from Kentucky that by the adoption of the amendment, there is no law now existing that would give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to put into effect any kind of program of acreage control on corn. The purpose of the amendment was merely to put corn in the same category as soybeans and other commodities in providing an opportunity for fluctuation in price supports, in the event that the Secretary of Agriculture saw fit to do so for the purpose of increasing production. After all, that is the purpose of the price support program.

What I argue against is a program under which the Federal Government would be compelled to support prices of commodities the supply of which was far in excess of our needs. That is why I attempted to place growers of corn and other feed grains in the same category as growers of tobacco, cotton, peanuts, rice, and wheat. As to the producers of those commodities, the support prices were fixed in the law. But in order to obtain the support prices, growers had to conform to acreage allotments. But that was not so in the case of corn and other feed grains. That was the essential difference between the programs affecting corn and those relating to other basic commodities.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I repeat that in no way do I question the good faith of the Senator from Louisiana, either with regard to the vote taken or in any way. There is no fairer man in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the question is on the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Minnesota to table the motion to reconsider.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota withhold his motion to lay on the table?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I withhold it.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to explain my position to the Senators who have come into the Chamber. I want to explain the purpose of my motion.

Today the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry offered an amendment which was adopted. Under present law, the 1958 act, the support price for corn is fixed at 90 percent of the average market price for the 3 preceding years, or at 65 percent of parity, whichever is higher. The effect of the chairman's amendment is to change the present law and to provide authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to fix the support price for the 1964 and subsequent crops of corn from 0 to 90 percent. It further provides that the support price shall be such as the Secretary determines will not increase the Commodity Credit Corporation's stocks of corn.

Under the authority, which would be given to the Secretary, he could provide price support at such level as he determines would not result in any net gain in Government stocks of corn. It means that there would be very little if any support for corn.

The amendment was adopted. I have moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted.

If my motion is successful, we will then vote again on the amendment. My purpose in opposing the amendment can be stated as follows:

First, I should like to give the situation as I understand it if the pending farm bill is adopted. A voluntary program for corn and other feed grains will be continued in 1963. Then, before 1964, Congress would have to act either to extend the voluntary program or, if it should not be extended, to provide another program for corn and other feed grains.

If no program should be provided, we would be back to the basic law, to the 1958 program, which now provides support for corn at 65 percent of parity, and for other feed grains at a price related to corn.

With the change which is offered in the support price by the chairman's amendment, there would be no program for corn and feed grains, in my judgment.

My reasons for questioning the amendment arise from the coercive effect it could play in the adoption of a compulsory feed grains program. The Department of Agriculture and the Secretary want Congress to adopt a compulsory feed grain control program. There are

those in the Senate and in Congress who also want to see the program adopted.

Others have opposed it, as I do for reasons which we have stated many times. We do not believe that the same argument can be made for the feed grain program as can be made for wheat which is the chief source of our surplus. Stocks of feed grains in surplus, while they represent large amounts in volume and value, actually are sufficient only to meet needs and use for a period not to exceed 6 months for corn, and similar periods of time for other feed grains. A drought, unusual use, or increased feeding of livestock, could greatly reduce these supplies. In fact, there might be shortages. We do not know what will happen a year or two years from now.

Many have raised the objection, when the bill was before us in the past months, that they do not want to see a situation develop in the country in which farmers cannot raise feed grains necessary for use on their own farms. That would be a radical departure in our farm programs; it would be something which has never before occurred in our country. Even the wheat program contains an exemption for wheat grown and fed on the same farm.

Another objection is that the compulsory feed grain program could lead ultimately to controls over livestock.

When the omnibus farm bill was before us in 1961, and the Secretary of Agriculture and his officials, it was clear that it might lead to controls over livestock.

It might be asked what this has to do with my motion to reconsider the amendment which was adopted, and to ask that the present support price for corn in the basic law be continued rather than to adopt the change proposed by the chairman that price supports be fixed at 0 to 90 percent and at a level which would result in no additional corn going into Government stocks.

I think it evident that if the Secretary of Agriculture had the power to fix support prices at any figure he wished between 0 and 90 percent, and also to give support only to the extent that the Government would take over no corn unless it sold an equal amount, farmers would have little choice, except to say, "We will accept the compulsory feed grain program." There would be no reasonable alternative.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator has just touched on a very sensitive and important phase of this particular amendment. The theory of support prices in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, from 0 to 90 percent, as a means of regulating the inducement or control of future crops, has much to be said in its favor. However, the Senator has just pointed out that such a proposal puts a substantially coercive power in the hands of the Secretary. We all realize that. He can fix the support price at any amount he wishes, from 90 percent to 0. This is very important,

considering the present attitude of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I call the Senator's attention to one particular fact and ask him if he agrees with me. Last year or a year and a half ago it was the direct testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture that he expected to use—and, in fact, he did use it last year—the authority to sell corn on the market in order, as he himself said, to hold the price of corn down, so as to coerce farmers into going into his emergency feed grain program. He used that power to coerce the farmers to accept the program which he wanted to force upon them.

I suggest that having already demonstrated his arbitrary power to sell corn on the market at the market price, and thus depress the market to \$1 or below on corn, it is reasonable to believe that having discretionary power from 0 to 90 percent, he might be very likely to use such power to threaten farmers with no support price whatsoever unless they accepted the compulsory control program. This has been the consistent purpose of the Department of Agriculture ever since the present administration took office more than a year and a half ago. Does the Senator from Kentucky believe that is a reasonable assumption?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Iowa is in error. It would be necessary for Congress to pass a law in order to give the Secretary such power. In other words, the Secretary of Agriculture would not have the power to say—if the amendment were adopted—that acreage controls would be, for example, at 50 percent of parity. He would have no such authority if the amendment were adopted.

The law now on the statute books, which would be repealed by this amendment, gives the Secretary of Agriculture the power, without even submitting the question to the corn growers, to say, "You can grow all the corn you desire, and you will get price supports ranging from 90 percent of the average of the 3 years' market price, or 65 percent of parity, which ever is higher."

This amendment would repeal that part of the law. In other words, the Secretary of Agriculture would not have to go to a support price of more than the rate I have just given, with unlimited production.

If the bill should be enacted with the amendment as proposed, the emergency program would be extended for another year. At the end of that year, the farmers would be free to plant all they wished, but without price supports, unless the Secretary desired to provide price supports in order to encourage production. The problem is that simple.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am referring to the language of the amendment. As I read it, it seems to be quite clear. It is the amendment offered by the

Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], designated "8-26-62-F." As I understand, that is the amendment which is now under discussion. It provides:

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this act, beginning with the 1964 crop, price support shall be made available to producers for each crop of corn at such level, not to exceed 90 per centum of the parity price therefor, as the Secretary determines will not result in increasing Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of corn.

If that does not give the Secretary the right to set the price support level from 0 to 90 percent, I do not understand the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. It does; but it would not be under compulsion. The Senator from Kentucky is afraid that if the amendment were adopted, the Secretary of Agriculture would have the right to control acreage.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not understand that to be the Senator's position.

Mr. COOPER. That is not my position; absolutely not. I am perfectly clear about the provision. I am completely in accord with the Senator's view of the purpose of the amendment. I know that if the bill is enacted, there will be a voluntary feed program in 1963. I understand, also, that if that program is not extended next year and if no other program is adopted, there will be a reversion to the 1958 act. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. ELLENDER. If my amendment were not adopted?

Mr. COOPER. If the amendment were not adopted, or under any other circumstance. If a new program were not adopted for 1964, and the voluntary program were not extended, there would be a reversion to the 1958 act. Corn producers would come under the 1958 act.

Mr. ELLENDER. After expiration of the extension of the emergency program.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly, if this amendment were not adopted, that would be the case.

Mr. COOPER. There is no contention on my part that if the amendment were adopted, the Secretary would be given power to fix acreage allotments, for that is not the case.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. With all due respect to the Senator, the amendment would not give the Secretary the right to fix any acreage allotment.

Mr. COOPER. I said that; I understand perfectly well. I want the Senator to understand my objection to the amendment.

The purpose of the administration, the purpose of the Secretary of Agriculture, the purpose of his advisers, the purpose of the Senator from Louisiana—and the Senator is perfectly honest and clear about it—is to secure passage of a compulsory feed grain program to become effective in 1964. I think the Senator will agree with me in that statement.

If the Senator's amendment were adopted, it would provide an instrument in the hands of the Secretary of Agri-

culture, which he would be required to use and which would have a coercive effect in achieving a compulsory feed grain program. If the Senator's amendment were adopted, the Secretary of Agriculture would, I believe, be required to establish supports at a low price. For the Senator's amendment provides that the support must be low enough so that there would be no increase in CCC stocks.

There would be no alternative to the compulsory program except a support price which would drive down the price. Farmers would find it necessary to move into a compulsory feed grain control program, whether they wished to go into it or not.

Next year, when we come to consider a new feed grains program, I want these alternatives available to the farmers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky concedes, does he not, that in order to initiate a program of compulsion, the Secretary of Agriculture would have to have Congress enact a law which would give him that power?

Mr. COOPER. Yes, I know that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. But I am arguing against this amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I cannot become alarmed about the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana. As I interpret it, it does not give the Secretary of Agriculture any authority to offer no price support at all. In fact, it says that price supports shall be made available to the producers of each crop, and then it gives the Secretary of Agriculture authority to set the price support at a level which will not exceed 90 percent of parity. In other words, it is an effort to control the production of corn, through the price support level, rather than through control of the number of acres to be planted.

I presume that the Secretary of Agriculture would determine the level of price support by looking at the amount of corn on hand and the amount which would be needed for the year. Undoubtedly he would also be governed by the corn growers' intentions to plant for that year. If on the first of March they showed an intention to increase greatly their planting, undoubtedly he would reduce the support level from the level at which he otherwise would set it.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. How does the amendment differ from the Aiken Act of 1948 and the Anderson Act of 1949, which provided for supports of from 0 to 90 percent?

Mr. AIKEN. Was it supported at 90 percent that year? I thought it was 60 percent.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. No, it was from 0 to 90 percent.

Mr. AIKEN. I take the Senator's word for it.

Mr. ELLENDER. We had that for all feed grains except corn.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. But there was then a yardstick by which the Secretary had to go. I wonder how that differed from the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. AIKEN. As I recall, the Secretary fixed the support price for corn at that time at from 60 to 90 percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. For corn, it was from 75 to 90 percent.

Mr. AIKEN. At any rate, I know that this proposal to regulate the production of a crop by means of the support level is a doctrine which I have heard many of my good old Republican friends preach for the last 20 years. We know that Secretary Benson asked for such an amendment; and I am delighted, and I am sure Secretary Benson will also be delighted to have the Senator from Louisiana offer the amendment for him at this time.

So, Mr. President, I am not alarmed about this amendment.

I am sure that regardless of whatever law we enact at this time, another agricultural program will be proposed next year, and another one will be proposed the next year. There has been one every year for the last 22 years that I have been here, and I do not know why we should assume that times would change in the next 22 years.

At any rate, this amendment appears to give the authority which Secretary Benson so earnestly requested. Finally, as I recall, he said he would accept a 60-percent minimum. However, Congress would not let him have that; and Congress made him take a 65-percent minimum, and President Eisenhower reluctantly signed that bill.

So I am a little amazed that the 1958 law is referred to as the Benson-Republican law, because it was not satisfactory to Secretary Benson, and the Republican President signed the bill reluctantly.

Nevertheless, as I have said, I am sure ex-Secretary of Agriculture Benson will be delighted to find that the Senator from Louisiana is at last supporting his proposal; and in that case I see nothing else to do but support the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise to support the position so ably stated by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who urged Members of the Senate to vote to reconsider the action taken by the Senate on the amendment—action taken when only a few Members of the Senate were on the floor, and taken without a yea or nay vote, and taken at a time when many Senators were in committee, in connection with their necessary committee responsibilities.

Mr. President, why do I ask that the vote on this amendment be reconsidered? I may say that I agree with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that this is the Benson flexible price support proposal; and I stand here as one who opposed the Benson proposal every

time Secretary Benson made it, at a time when a President of my own political persuasion was in the White House. I see no reason to change my position now, just because some of the Democratic Members of the Senate have become Johnny-come-lately converts to the Benson philosophy. I was against it then, and I am against it now, insofar as it pertains to eliminating all the mandatory price supports and giving to the Secretary of Agriculture the right to set flexible price supports at from 0 to 90 percent.

I think there are even more valid reasons to oppose this flexible price support formula now than were available to me when I was against this provision during the administration of Mr. Eisenhower and Secretary Benson, because, as now placed before us, this is a more stringent approach and a more direct blow at price supports than was the case when Secretary Benson proposed it originally.

I call attention to the fact that this proposal that the Secretary of Agriculture be given the right to set price supports at from 0 to 90 percent is not even as innocent as it would seem if one were to stop right there, for I ask Senators to continue to read the amendment, and read the provision at the top of page 2, and consider the straitjacket in which the amendment would put the Secretary of Agriculture, from the standpoint of being unable to provide a fair and reasonable price to the corn producers. They were not content to give the Secretary of Agriculture the right to set the price supports at from 0 to 90 percent.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. A little while ago, in colloquy with the Senator from Vermont, I stated that the support price for corn under the Aiken Act of 1948 and under the Anderson Act of 1949 was from 0 to 90 percent. But in checking on it, I find that the price support for corn was from 60 to 90 percent, and the price support of all other feed grains was from 0 to 90 percent. I wish to make that correction.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. President, this amendment is out-Bensonning Benson, and is doing so in a big way, because they are not content to give the Secretary of Agriculture the right to fix price supports on corn at from 0 to 90 percent, but they also include a mandate and a guideline, and put him in a vise, and say, "The Secretary can set the price supports on corn at from 0 to 90 percent"; but in line 2 they say "at such price level as the Secretary determines will not result in increasing Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of corn."

But, Mr. President, in view of the present status of corn stocks and the present status of production and the present status of the science of farming, this language probably would compel the Secretary of Agriculture to put price supports on corn at 0 minus 10 percent, and thus would make the farmer

pay a penalty for raising corn. No doubt they could not even afford to set price supports at zero, because they would insist that it be at such a level that not one kernel of corn would be added to the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks; and in view of the vast stocks on hand and the productive capacity of the country, no Secretary of Agriculture could, under these instructions, live with himself and be a self-respecting and honest public official and put any price whatever on corn.

So I submit that all at once we find the Democrats out-Bensonning Benson. I suspect they should get a special plane and fly out to Salt Lake City and publicly and collectively apologize to Secretary Benson that they took so long to become converted to the Benson philosophy. I freely give them my seat on the plane, because I am not going. I have not changed my mind. I think we owe the farmers some kind of price supports, the same kind of consideration as was given to all other segments of the economy, where we have permeating through the economy all kinds of guarantees and safeguards for shippers, bankers, industrialists, manufacturers, the merchant marine. But now, all at once, the corn farmer is told, "You are going to be reduced to a situation where an honest Secretary of Agriculture is going to have to fix your price supports at zero."

That is not all. I would like now to talk to Senators whose areas do not raise much corn—

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he launches into a discussion of that particular phase of his dissertation?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator agree that the purpose of the amendment is to knock out the 1949 act provisions?

Mr. MUNDT. So far as corn is concerned.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. And the so-called 1949 act, as amended in 1958—

Mr. ELLENDER. The 1958 act.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The 1958 provisions of the 1949 act. In 1958 changes were made in the 1949 act. I refer to section 105, which says in effect that beginning with the 1959 crop, price supports shall be made available to producers at 90 percent of the average price received by farmers during the 3 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the marketing year for such crop begins, adjusted to offset the effect of such price of any abnormal quantities of low-grade corn marketed during any of such year, provided that the level of price support for any crop of corn shall not be less than 65 percent of parity thereafter.

In other words, while there is a formula for price supports on corn, there is a safeguard of 65 percent below which the price cannot go under any circumstances.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. So the present law is not 0 to 90 percent, but, in

effect, 90 percent of the average price of the preceding 3 years, but in no case less than 65 percent.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct. There now are two safeguards. The second safeguard absolutely prohibits the price support from dropping below 65 percent.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. My question is, Why monkey with the 1958 act at all? Why not leave it as it is? What is to be accomplished by this amendment?

Mr. MUNDT. I believe the present act is unsatisfactory in the manner that it is inadequate to do the job that needs to be done to protect the corn farmers, but it is immeasurably better than eliminating the safeguards altogether. What the Ellender amendment proposes to do is finally to get around to what some people have been trying to do for some time, including the Committee on Economic Development, and that is to take the minimum wage protection away from the farmer, which he has in the way of price supports, while workers in manufacturing have a minimum wage.

This is a proposal to go full wheel around and say to the farmer, "You are going to have no protection at all, while the products that you purchase in the way of machinery and supplies from industry will have the protection of a minimum wage for the working people." Because the people in industry have a minimum wage, and they probably are entitled to it, it has been necessary to provide some kind of minimum wage for the farmers who buy the products of industry. Now the farmers are being told all at once, "You will get no kind of protection. You will get nothing which will reduce your costs. You will get nothing which will reduce the cost of supplies you buy from industry which are held up because of minimum wages in the industry." The farmer is simply being told, "We are not going to do anything for you, except to slide your price supports down to zero."

Let me say to Senators who do not come primarily from corn areas, I think every Senator represents farmers who raise some kind of feed grains on the farm. May I point out that it is not proposed that the whole act shall be repealed. I call attention to title 3, which is not repealed, which is really going to put the farmer in the poorhouse if the amendment is followed. Let me illustrate.

Title III, section 302, provides—and this would be continued—

Without restricting price supports to those commodities for which the marketing quota or marketing agreement or order program is in effect, price support shall insofar as feasible be made available to producers of any storable nonbasic agricultural commodity for which such a program is in effect and who are complying with such program.

Now we are talking about oats. Now we are talking about barley. Now we are talking about all the other feed grains which come into the picture.

What are the rules which obtain in that connection? I read them because they are found in section 401, subparagraph (b) of the 1949 act, which would

remain in the law if price supports were allowed to go down to zero.

It provides:

The price supports at which other commodities—

These are all the other feed grains—

are being supported, and in the case of feed grains, the feed values of such grains in relation to corn—

So it means the price supports are going to be cut down on every other feed grain in relation to corn value at zero per bushel, if the Secretary goes the full route. And the Secretary, if he is an honest man, a responsible public official, has no other choice, in view of what is included in the Ellender amendment, that the Secretary must provide price supports to producers for each crop of corn at such level as the Secretary determines will not result in increasing Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of corn.

If Senators want to scuttle the farm program, if they want to jump across and go on record as saying we are not going to give the producers of corn, barley, oats, and feed grains any protection whatsoever, they are not going to do it with the vote of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. If this amendment is adopted, for how long a time will it continue by its terms? Is it to be permanent law?

Mr. MUNDT. It will become permanent law.

Mr. CURTIS. Does this proposal have the support of Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and of the President of the United States?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not see the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry present, but the acting majority leader [Mr. HUMPHREY] could probably tell us, because I think he knows something about the Secretary of Agriculture. I wonder if he could advise the Senate whether the Secretary of Agriculture supports the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not know that the Secretary of Agriculture has advanced this proposal. I understand this is the handiwork of the chairman of the committee, and the chairman has spoken as to its purposes. I do not think one could commit the Secretary of Agriculture to this particular phase of the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. I think it is important that we know whether or not the Secretary is opposed to it, because—

Mr. MUNDT. As a partial answer, I have heard the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, who is a neighbor of mine, on television and radio berate Secretary Benson time after time after time because Benson favored this flexible price proposal. So I think it would be an extremely quick switch if the Secretary of Agriculture now favors the philosophy which he condemned because he thought it was wrong when Benson proposed it. So, unless the Secretary has made a complete about-face, he would have to be opposed to this proposal.

Mr. CURTIS. I think we should know before we vote.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree. I think we should know all about this amendment. I think we should know about feed grains. I am now going into a segment of agriculture that is going to be undermined even more.

Mr. CURTIS. Suppose this provision became permanent law and the Secretary, in order not to increase the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, materially lowered the present support price.

It is contended by a great many farmers and nonfarmers that when such a thing happens some farmers are compelled, in order to stay in business, to produce more bushels. So they plant the crop thicker. They tend the crop more vigorously. They add more fertilizer. They add more water. If they do that and end up by actually producing more corn, thus adding to the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, what then, under the mandatory language, must the Secretary do the following year?

Mr. MUNDT. I will tell the Senator what he will do. The Senator from Kentucky put his finger on that.

Mr. CURTIS. What must he do?

Mr. MUNDT. There will then be chaos. Since the Secretary would not have permission, under the bill, to put the price supports for corn at less than zero, since he would not have authority to say to the farmer, "We will give you a zero price support and fine you 10 cents a bushel for raising corn," he will then have to come along with a mandatory control program, which the House of Representatives so emphatically rejected the last time. We shall then be confronted by a situation in which the farmer will have to have a license to grow corn. There will be a compulsory program all down the line. The farmer will be told how much corn he can raise, how to raise it, and at what price he can sell it.

The Senator from Louisiana is quite correct in saying that this would require new legislation, but at that time there would be such chaos that nothing else would make sense, because the proposal in the amendment does not go quite far enough to give the Secretary of Agriculture the right he would have to have to make the amendment effective, which is the right to penalize and to fine the corn farmer 10 or 15 cents a bushel for every bushel raised. If that were done, then it might be possible to cut the surplus. It would also ruin agriculture.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator will yield further, I wish to say that the time has long since passed when we should have discarded a negative approach to agriculture. This Congress should direct its attention to the greater uses of and greater markets for agricultural products, rather than follow a policy of continual retrenchment. It is entirely possible that if such were done the production momentum would not be even as great as it is now.

There was appointed, pursuant to an act of Congress, a bipartisan commission to recommend industrial uses of our

farm surpluses. It is my information that our overall surpluses run only about 7 percent. The world surpluses are in starches, not in proteins. From starches we can, through chemistry, make perhaps almost everything we use in our industrial plants.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from South Dakota has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FELL in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a group of us must attend a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations, for a markup. We would like to be present for the vote. I wonder if the Senator will yield so that we may ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. The motion pending is the motion to reconsider.

Mr. HOLLAND. Or on the motion to lay on the table.

Mr. MUNDT. A motion to lay on the table has not yet been made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at the proper time I shall move to lay the motion on the table, but I have tried to accommodate Senators, at the request of the Senator from Kentucky. I do not think the yeas and nays can be ordered until the motion to lay on the table is made. I did not wish to cut off debate.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator ascertain the attitude of the Department of Agriculture before he presses for a vote on this question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The chairman of the committee will be in the Chamber in a short time. May I say that there does not seem to have been too much regard for the attitude of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. CURTIS. I pay regular attention to him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not see why we should overburden him at the moment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe the request is a reasonable one. Senators would like to be present for the vote. I have no idea how many members of the Appropriations Committee will wish to vote on the question. We would like to be advised and have time to get to the Chamber. The only way that can be accomplished is by having the yeas and nays ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays cannot be ordered on a motion which is not pending.

Mr. MUNDT. The motion to reconsider is pending.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further, so that I may complete my thought?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. A distinguished resident of Nebraska, Mr. J. Leroy Welsh, headed that commission. I regret to report that a Department of Agriculture has not existed since then which would wholeheartedly grasp the report of that

commission and sympathetically and determinedly undertake to put it into operation. Until we have that, I think we shall render a disservice to agriculture.

I wonder if the Senator would agree.

Mr. MUNDT. I invite the attention of the Senator from Nebraska to the fact that on page 94 of the pending bill can be found title V, which was added to the bill on motion by the Senator from South Dakota, which would provide an industrial uses section, which at long last would enable us to go forward with the program of industrial utilization of farm products spelled out in complete detail.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand, but I am speaking of the attitude of the Department.

Mr. MUNDT. So far as the Department is concerned, it has not taken a position on this particular title, which was added in the committee. I hope that the House will approve it. If we pass an agricultural bill, this is the one part of the bill which makes economic sense.

Mr. President, in the event there can be order in the Chamber, I should like to discuss another phase of the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senate is in order. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have pointed out that the Ellender amendment not only would shoot price supports out from under the corn farmers, but also would do equally devastating damage to the producers of every other feed grain, because their price supports are necessarily related to the price supports for corn under the Agricultural Act of 1949, and that is spelled out in detail in section 401(b).

In addition to all this, Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of Senators in the dairy field, or whose constituents are in that field or who raise livestock—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate and the galleries will be in order.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, either we should try to obtain order, or suspend without order, because I hate to be interrupted every 15 seconds by a request for order. If the Presiding Officer will insist upon order, and get it and keep it, we can proceed with much more dispatch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be order in the Chamber.

Mr. MUNDT. Let us take a look at the livestock industry—hogs, sheep, poultry and cattle. If we provide a situation in which there will be no price supports whatsoever for a basic feed like corn, we shall create chaos in the livestock industry, because the relationship between livestock prices and the prices of basic feeds is well established and is a well-recognized economic principle. Immediately we would create a situation in which a clamor would come forth, "Now we have chaos on the farms. We have all kinds of disproportionate relationships as between the number of cattle and the number of hogs and the price of corn, and we shall have to have man-

datory controls not only on feed grains," as they will tell us, "but also upon livestock."

The amendment, intentionally or unintentionally, puts a loaded gun at the head of every farmer in America, saying, "Look, chum, you had better come along with this compulsory program submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture in January or you are going to go broke whether you raise corn, feed grains, or livestock."

All of the existing safeguards will have been stripped away. All the present protections will be gone. We shall have to live with this program, which is so devoid of price supports that, to give due credit to Ezra Benson, he never remotely suggested a program as viciously directed against the destruction of price supports as this one which the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has presented before the Senate today.

I think on the call of the roll it will be interesting to note, among the Senators who have condemned and criticized Mr. Benson in the past, how many now propose to support him, after he has gone out, and how many will remain consistent as to an economic position in farm policy, regardless of whether it is espoused by a Democrat or a Republican.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly, Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska is within his rights on his request. Every Senator should be interested in the answer. "Where does the Secretary of Agriculture stand today on this new Benson-Freeman program of flexible price supports?"

What is the attitude of Secretary Freeman as an agricultural administrator on the program which he attacked so roughly when he was a politician criticizing Secretary Benson, who then held the job? I think we ought to know what the attitude of the President is. I would be shocked if the President would not veto a bill which would put in motion the program of Ezra Benson, which Candidate Kennedy went from one end of the land to the other to criticize in the fall of 1960. The farmers are entitled to some consistency, and not merely a great deal of partisan palaver about what constitutes a sound economic program for the American farmer.

I urge the Senate, therefore, in the yea and nay vote, to reconsider the amendment, so that at least if the amendment is before the Senate, we can amend it and tailor it to provide some kind of safeguard, security, and protection for the corn farmer, the feed grain farmer, and the livestock producers of America. I hope that no member of the Democratic leadership will move to lay the amendment on the table, thereby publicly proclaiming that the Ellender amendment with its flexible price supports has become the official position of the Democratic Party. I do not know why they have made a complete about-face and suddenly now support the programs of Benson, which they used as a means of attacking Republicans in the last presidential campaign. Let us iron out our differences by reconsidering the

action. Let us subject the Ellender amendment to other amendments which might modify it. Then let us continue with the present program for another year so we can consider permanent farm legislation without placing a shotgun at the head of every American farmer and telling him, "Either you surrender your freedom or you surrender your opportunity for success."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To uphold the Benson philosophy, is it the position of the Senator from South Dakota that Senators would have to support the views covered by the Senator from Louisiana in his amendment?

Mr. MUNDT. There are other ways in which one could uphold the Benson philosophy. I said that the amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana contained the Benson program tightened up and made more effective by eliminating even the safeguards incorporated by Secretary Benson when he originated the 0 to 90 percent price support formula.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it the contention of the Senator that if the bill were not one which would tighten up and make more rigid the Benson plan, the proposal of the Senator from Louisiana would be acceptable?

Mr. MUNDT. No; I would not accept it. I was opposed to it in its original form, but not because Secretary Benson espoused it. Secretary Benson is a Republican, and I am a Republican. He presented it as a Republican administration measure. It was favored by President Eisenhower, whom I supported. However, two opposed this flexible price support formula when presented by my fellow Republicans and two oppose it now when it has been belatedly embraced by the Democrats.

I was opposed to the legislation because it contained economic fallacies, as I saw them, when the measure was proposed by Secretary Benson and President Eisenhower. I am against them fully as much and for the same reasons, now that they are proposed by a group of Democrats on the floor of the Senate. I am against them more emphatically, because, to give Ezra Benson due credit, when he proposed his flexible price supports, he at least provided some safeguards, some criteria, some measuring rods which gave his suggestion more protective power for the farmer than the present measure would provide. The Ellender proposal would strip away what little protection was contained in the program originated by Secretary Benson.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Insofar as the Benson plan is at issue, how would a Senator have to vote in order to show approval of the Benson plan?

Mr. MUNDT. I suspect if one were a dedicated follower of the Benson concept of farm economics, he would vote for the Ellender amendment, because it out-Bensons Benson. It would take those things about the Benson program which I think are bad for the farmer, and make them even worse.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to make an observation and see if the Senator agrees with me in connection with the statement that the Ellender amendment would out-Benson Benson. I would be inclined to go along with him for the following reason, among others: There is another factor that enters into the whole picture, or will shortly enter into it. That is the factor of the export volume of our feed grains, including corn. Very shortly there will come before the Senate a trade bill. In his message to the Congress, the President pointed out that one reason for the trade bill as drafted by his advisers was to assure a continuation of the export of our agricultural commodities.

Unfortunately, about a week after the President's message to Congress, the Common Market adopted a policy of self-sufficiency in agriculture, a policy with which I know the Senator is familiar. It seems to me that if we should give the President a trade bill with the powers for which he has asked, and a hard bargaining position were arrived at, the question might arise as to whether we are going to continue the agriculture export switch envisioned at the time the President submitted the bill to us. Perhaps the hard bargaining might become a little softer if the proposed legislation were on the books, because the farmers, and not the Government, would pay the price. The farmers would suffer as a result of soft bargaining with the Common Market on the part of the administration: Am I correct in that observation?

Mr. MUNDT. In other words, in bargaining to protect itself, to recapture its investment, and get rid of the corn which it now owns, the Government would merely act as an agent of the farmer, who would be the owner of the corn?

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. MILLER. I suggest that the proposal is even more vicious in its potential impact upon our farmers than any of the policies attributed to the former Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct. In addition to the reasons I previously stated, the measure would eliminate any price support whatever for the farmer. Secretary Benson was willing to settle for a pretty low support price of 60 to 65 percent; he never contemplated pushing it down to zero.

It would eliminate the criteria under which the Benson formula gave direction to the Secretary of Agriculture as to the level at which he had to fix price supports and the conditions under which they would prevail.

It would put an impossible compunction upon the Secretary of Agriculture by telling him, "You must establish price supports for corn low enough so that not a bushel of corn will be added to the Commodity Credit Corporation surplus." That is merely a longwinded Senatorial filibusterer's way of saying, "You

must establish price supports for corn under prevailing conditions at zero."

Mr. MILLER. That would be the situation regardless of how soft the bargaining position might be with respect to agricultural exports in the Common Market.

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely, because the measuring rod is how much corn is there in the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] asked about the amendment position. I should like to respond, by stating what I believe the amendment would do.

During World War II, and until the Aiken bill was passed in 1948, and later the Anderson bill in 1949, corn as one of the basic crops was supported at 90 percent of parity. When the Aiken bill was passed, corn was supported at 75 to 90 percent of parity. Under the Anderson bill of 1949, corn was supported at 75 to 90 percent.

In 1958, when the present provision of law was passed, corn was supported at 65 percent of parity, or 90 percent of the average of the market price in the 3 preceding years, whichever is higher.

There has been a floor for corn, since World War II.

The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana would remove the floor. The support would be from 0 to 90 percent. It could be fixed at any point between 0 and 90 percent. For the first time since World War II, the price support floor would be removed from corn.

A second point, which I raised regarding the amendment, goes to the effect it might have on a change in the feed grain program. I believe there should be a change in the 1958 act, relating to corn and feed grains. I do not favor the compulsory program. It may be that farmers at some later date will want a compulsory feed grain program. They do not want one today. If the farmers are given an opportunity to consider the compulsory proposal and all reasonable alternatives, and make their choice—it is all right. But they are the ones concerned, and they ought to be given full opportunity to make the decision in this matter and fair alternatives.

I object to the administration's attempt to stuff down the throats of farmers and of the Congress the compulsory feed grain program, until there has been full opportunity for farmers and the Congress to study it, and a chance to see whether an alternative voluntary program can be adopted.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's contribution. He has put the alternative before the Senate very clearly. I can see how the Ellender proposal would have the support of two groups of Senators. The first group consists of those who believe in the compulsory program, known as the Kennedy-Cochrane-Freeman compulsory program, which we have before us and which was rejected by the House. Anyone who believes in that program, I suspect, would be in favor of this program, because this loads the gun and

cocks the trigger and holds it to the head of the farmer and says, "You are on the way to bankruptcy. You cannot live with zero price supports. Therefore, to survive you must accept our program of compulsory controls and farming operations directed from Washington."

The other group consists of the dedicated disciples of the Benson flexible price support policy, some of whom it seems have been masquerading behind false faces for many years, because they have been attacking it on the Senate floor and on the political hustings, but who now seem to be in the vanguard of those who are supporting his flexible price support philosophy on the floor of the Senate today.

Now that we know who they are, I suspect that they also would support the Ellender proposal, as, of course, will any in this body who favor no farm program at all.

I do not understand how anyone else could support it.

If the amendment stays in the bill I certainly will vote against the bill on final passage, and do everything I can to get every additional Senator to vote against it, because I believe it sounds the death knell to farm opportunity in America. I believe it is the beginning of the end of the family farmer and his capacity to succeed. After 25 years of working with the concept of price support, we now, in one fell swoop, would change it to a minimum price support of zero.

I hope that the leadership on the other side will permit this vote to occur on the motion to reconsider, so we can have an adequate discussion of it and so we can have debate on the merits of it. I hope that the Democratic leadership does not make it official Democratic policy that they support the Ellender amendment by offering the motion to lay on the table, which everyone in the Senate knows is always used as an expression of the official policy of the majority party. Let us have free and open discussion. Let us have a chance to argue the issue on its merits. Let us find out, if we can, where the Secretary of Agriculture stands on this revolutionary approach that would alter the whole concept of agricultural legislation after a quarter of a century of working with it and trying to improve it and refine it.

If we do reconsider it, let us try to write something which is adequate and honest. All of us recognize that the existing legislation needs refinement and needs changes and needs modification. Let us not put ourselves in the strait-jacket where there is no choice except to watch the farmers go broke and stay free, or let the farmers become enslaved and entrapped by a compulsory program which can never make the farmers prosperous, but which at best might prevent them from dying in the poorhouse.

It is unfortunate that this debate could not have occurred at the time the amendment was introduced. I trust the Democratic leadership will exercise forbearance and not make it a party issue and a party position and a party

policy by offering a motion to lay on the table and thereby stultify the debate. I believe that if we can have the issues ventilated and the Ellender amendment reconsidered the Senate will have a second choice to register its will and express its attitude on this new adventure which is now being proposed for the farmers of America by using them as guinea pigs, but which will have a devastating effect on the producer of every feed grain and ultimately will have its worst impact on dairymen and cattlemen and people engaged in the livestock production in America.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER obtained the floor.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand that the Senator from Nebraska must go to a committee meeting, and that he would like to make a brief statement. I therefore ask that I may yield to him for that purpose, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa for his unfailing courtesy.

I rise to support the position of those who have spoken against the Ellender amendment and in favor of the motion to reconsider the vote by which it was adopted. I say to my colleague that there is more involved here than simply the reconsideration of an amendment. There is more involved here than simply the removal of the 65-percent floor on price supports for corn. What is involved here is a matter of far-reaching impact as it ultimately will involve not only the corn farmers but also the feed grain farmers and livestock farmers and poultrymen—in short, the producers of all agricultural products.

I say this because the amendment would place in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture a bludgeoning tool that would put him in a position to force the adoption and approval by the American farmers of a plan which would pretty much follow the plan turned down by the House and defeated there. It calls for compulsory controls on feed grains. There is no question about it. The amendment, if adopted and eventually becomes the law, will enable the Secretary of Agriculture to put price supports at such a low level that the corn farmers of this country will literally crawl on their hands and knees to Congress to ask for what the Secretary of Agriculture wants and what the White House wants and what the leadership of the House and the leadership of the Senate want; namely, a compulsory feed grain program.

We do not need to belabor the point. The position of those who have advocated the compulsory feed grain program has not altered one iota. They are still firmly holding to their original position. Yesterday we heard the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry state repeatedly that it is his belief that we ought to adopt the compulsory feed grain program.

That is enunciated notwithstanding the defeat of the program by the House. It is offered in spite of the fact that the House bill, now before us, and as passed by the House not long ago, does not provide for wheat.

Irrespective of those facts, the House leadership, the Senate leadership, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the White House still want the supply management concept of compulsory feed grain control. They are still working for it. Why this concern about it? Is only corn involved? Of course not. As soon as compulsory controls are forced upon the corn farmers of the Nation, we would find soon afterward the same type of program applied to other feed grains.

That would be followed in short order by placing livestock under similar production controls. In turn, poultry, dairy products, and all other products of agriculture would be placed under production controls. That pattern would inevitably unfold.

The designation of the feed grains program as compulsory—which the Kennedy-Cochrane-Freeman program is—is logical and accurate. It was concocted in the mind of Dr. Willard Cochrane, Chief Economic Adviser to Secretary of Agriculture Freeman.

In November 1959, Dr. Cochrane first advocated this theory of supply management of feed grains and other products. As long ago as that he contended, in an article published in the *Journal of Farm Economics*, that livestock would come under this program. It was not mentioned specifically, nor was it expressly provided for in the omnibus farm bill of 1961. His statement is as follows:

It is possible that the longrun price elasticity of beef at retail is greater than one, and some remote possibility that this price elasticity at the farm price level is greater than one. For these reasons, beef producers probably would not want to initiate supply control, and they would be justified in sitting out any early moves toward supply control.

It is probably the case, however, that beef producers would be forced to accept supply control if producers in the above aggregate of animal products adopted supply control.

I remind the Senate that in my State roughly 50 percent of the agricultural income is derived from livestock sources. That means a great deal to the people who live in Nebraska and in neighboring States.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if the Senator from Nebraska has shared the concern of the Senator from South Dakota over the manner in which the present Secretary of Agriculture and the present administration have beaten a retreat from programs designed to provide adequate farm income almost since the day they took the oath of office. Since 1938, when farm legislation was first written in this direction, parity prices have been the lodestone. We have always tried to provide for the farmer full parity, if possible—and either 90 percent of parity or 65 percent of parity or 70 percent of parity as a minimum floor—throughout the farm belt. For well over 25 years

we have been interested in providing parity for the farmer.

I have noticed that two or three times in public meetings the Secretary of Agriculture has been steering away from talking about parity and is now speaking about net income for farmers. I suppose he has been discouraged or embarrassed by the fact that parity has been dropping under his administration; that the farmer has been receiving a smaller percentage of parity under the Democrats than he got under the Republicans. Under the Republicans, it was not good enough; but when parity dropped from 81 to 78 percent and 79 percent the Secretary began to say that parity is not so important; that what we ought to talk about is net income for the farmers.

It was quickly pointed out that net income to the farmer is a meaningless figure, depending on the caprice of weather. Sometimes there is big production and big net income; in some years there is low production and low income. But if we merely talk about net income, without relating it to the costs to the farmer for the maintenance of his family, for the education of his children, and for his livelihood in general, it is a meaningless figure.

But now they have abandoned both parity and net income; and it is proposed to relate the price supports to the amount of stocks of the various commodities in the Commodity Credit Corporation. This has no relationship to the economy of the farmer; it has no relationship to his capacity to survive. Merely to say that we will pay the farmer in conformity with whatever amount of commodities we find in the Commodity Credit Corporation seems to me to be a sad retreat from the position which was announced to us when Mr. Freeman and Mr. Kennedy took office, when they were committed by the promise to provide the farmer with a greater degree of parity. But now they say to the farmer, "We will pay you in conformity with the amount, in reverse proportion, of the commodities we find in the Government storehouse."

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is absolutely correct in pointing out these facts. I can recall the years President Eisenhower was in office, when members of the present administration made speech after speech and quotation after quotation from their party platform, to the effect that price supports should be at least 100 percent of parity. They were pleading, "Send us in, coach; we will do the job. We will hit the line hard and see to it that you get 100 percent of parity."

For some reason, with a clear 2-to-1 majority in the Senate, and with an 85 margin in the House, the party now controlling the White House and all the executive departments is retreating from these programs, pledges, and promises. I agree with the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Let us consider the farm program as a whole. There are

Government price support programs not only for corn, but also for wheat, oats, and other feed grains. There are also price support programs for cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts. Does the Senator from Nebraska believe that if Congress in its wisdom should decide to destroy the price support program for corn and substitute some kind of compulsory program for wheat, before long we would have a price support program operating in the case of a few selected crops in the South? Important as our southern comrades are, acting together as they vote, they are only 24 out of 100. If they succeed in having imposed upon the corn and feed grains farm economy the concept that price supports should run down to zero, no doubt there would be a demand upon the Senate and the House that southern farmers also be subjected to the same reductions as have been put upon the rest of the farmers.

Mr. HRUSKA. It would not be very long.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Since this proposal is being tied into the stockpile of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and deals exclusively with corn at the moment, I find that 1,650 million bushels of corn are in surplus or in the stockpile. Since the new proposal is to be based upon the support price that the Secretary decides upon, and will be based upon the stockpile of corn, plus what the Secretary anticipates the farmers will grow, why would not a better plan be to freeze the 1,650 million bushels, or a big portion of it, and take it completely out of competition with what the farmer will grow beginning next January 1? Then there would be a free and open market for corn at a much higher price than now exists, and the farmers would be prosperous.

That is my opinion of what should be considered. The stockpile is a liability, not an asset. It has a tendency to depress the prices which are received by the farmers, and it costs the American taxpayers many millions of dollars to store the stockpile. It cost hundreds of millions of dollars to acquire it in the first place. So why is not this a good time to freeze a large portion of it and get the Government out of the agricultural commodity business? I am in favor of doing that, both in regard to corn and in regard to other businesses. Then we could use the corn to feed hungry people in the United States and hungry people elsewhere in the world, and we would get the Government out of the corn business, and we would place the farmers in a position in which they would grow for the open market, and would get a much higher price, in my opinion, than the one they are getting now.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Indiana for that alternative suggestion. It is a much better proposal than the one being made by the authors of this amendment.

To show the tendency, I should like to read again from the Farm Quarterly for the summer of 1960, where Dr. Cochrane

was interviewed by the managing editor, Charles R. Koch. Here is Dr. Cochrane's answer to a question posed by Mr. Koch:

It would not be a matter of encouragement; some of them would be forced in. If you had a control on hogs, for example, none on eggs, growers would transfer their corn into the production of more poultry and more eggs. It would be this old transfer of resources devil all over again. The feed resources released from hogs would be put through chickens to produce eggs; and eggs happen to be inelastic in demand, and in just a little bit they'd be in real trouble. The feed grain would also be transferred to beef, and beef producers would feel some pressure.

So, Mr. President, that is the basis for my suggestion and contention that more is involved than the mere elimination of the 65-percent price support as protection for the producers of corn. The impact would ultimately be felt in all facets of agriculture and in all areas of the country. That consideration is in addition to the argument made by the Senator from South Dakota. If this program were to be required as regards corn, feed grains, and livestock, it would not be long before it would be transferred to other basic crops which are now under price supports.

For these reasons, I suggest that the motion to reconsider be adopted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Nebraska concedes that in order to carry through what he now suggests, Congress would have to act upon a law which would give that power, does he not?

Mr. HRUSKA. That is true. But the point is that if the Secretary of Agriculture is given those tools to prepare the political climate among the feed grain farmers and the corn farmers, they will be confronted with the prospects of accepting either an inordinately low price support for corn or accepting the compulsory feed grains program or compulsory corn program. The Secretary of Agriculture will have the means within his command to operate on a "rule or ruin" basis. I say we are doing agriculture a disservice if we eliminate from the present law the 65-percent floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield further?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator from Nebraska well knows, as chairman of the committee I advocated that retention of the 65 percent of parity support price or 90 percent of the average market price for the last 3 years, but on condition that there be acreage control. But what the Senator from Nebraska is now advocating is that we continue the old law—the 1958 act, which means the planting and cultivation and production of all the corn and other feed grains a farmer desires to plant, with Uncle Sam holding the bag.

Mr. HRUSKA. I do not know that I am advocating the 1958 feed grains program. But it is preferable to the compulsory program which Secretary Freeman has in his hat and would like to impose on the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that the Senator from Nebraska voted against the proposal, as submitted in May, to retain the supports at the present levels, with acreage controls.

Mr. HRUSKA. There are many alternatives to the situation which faces us; and they are not confined to the 1958 act alone.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I can name one of the alternatives, namely, continuation for another year of the present corn program, as was recommended by Secretary Freeman before he read the Cochrane book. He brought that program before the committee last year, and we adopted it. It did cut down the surplus of corn—not to the extent he thought it would, but it did cut it down, even though it did not cut it down to the extent we would wish. But before Secretary Freeman read the Cochrane book, that is what he suggested.

What the Senator from Louisiana says is quite true. He says that before the Secretary of Agriculture could institute a compulsory program—the one which he and Freeman and Dr. Cochrane want—and before he could have complete controls over the farmers under that concept, Congress would have to pass such a law. Of course that is correct.

But does not the Senator agree that Members of the Senate and Members of the House should be entitled to consider reasonable alternative programs for the farmers, and then be confronted with a new administration suggestion next year, rather than be confronted now with a program which is driving farmers to bankruptcy and is bringing chaos to the livestock industry and is forcing the feed grain producers to shut down their operations? Instead of subjecting the farmers to such desperate conditions, should we not be able to consider the program and debate it during a period of calmness when a good program is being followed?

Mr. HRUSKA. We should, indeed.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] for yielding to me.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have been very glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska. He has given a very lucid explanation, as did the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

My remarks will be very brief, and will be in the nature of canvassing the agricultural situation with respect to the general posture not only of this amendment but also of the entire bill.

Because so much has been said on the farm issue, both in and out of Congress, during the current session, I feel there is a real need to try to set the record straight as regards to the situation in which we find ourselves today.

First, let me make it perfectly clear that I intend to vote against the current farm bill—H.R. 12391—before this body.

The record will show that I voted against S. 3225 when it was passed by a very narrow margin in the Senate several weeks ago. The record also shows that the House on a bipartisan basis would not accept a similar version of this original Senate bill. The record also shows that the House Agricultural Committee tabled—or killed—S. 3225 when it was considered by that body. Now we have the spectacle of another version of this effort before this body in connection with H.R. 12391.

It is my desire to explain briefly why I must vote against this current bill before the Senate. Next, I want to set the record straight regarding the Agricultural Act of 1958. Finally, I want to point out that it would be far better to have no new farm legislation rather than to pass the bill that is before us.

My greatest objections to H.R. 12391 are in connection with title III. This title deals with wheat and feed grains.

This bill contains the latest and most unworkable version of the costly multiple-price plan for wheat. The proposed plan is by far the most objectionable version of any multiple-price plan which has been considered by the Senate since I have been here.

There are many reasons why the multiple-price wheat plan in H.R. 12391 would be bad for farmers, consumers, taxpayers, and for our international relations. I shall list and discuss several of these reasons.

This multiple-price wheat plan if enacted into law would:

First. Guarantee a shortage of needed types of wheat production for the future, because it proposes to cut back all wheat producers the same amount even though the wheat they produce may be in short supply. It does this as a permanent thing by issuing certificates to all producers on a pro rata basis. This will result in inefficiency and higher costs all the way from the producer to the consumer.

Second. Insure that growers of poor quality milling wheat will continue to produce all the wheat they can, because they, too, will get their certificates on a pro rata basis. Thus we will continue to pile up unwanted wheat.

Third. Permits all export wheat—including Public Law 480 and other giveaway wheat—in the "primary market," along with domestic food wheat. This is an insult to the intelligence of American taxpayers. This move is an inexcusable affront to those who would like to see an honest, fair, and reasonable program worked out for wheat that has some hope of solving the surplus problem.

Fourth. Be most unfair to all feed grain growers because of its Government rigged pricing mechanism, guaranteeing a high price for all domestic food and export wheat—including giveaway wheat—and a feed price for all the surplus. It is unfair because it permits, by Government rigging of prices, a high net blend price for wheat, and thus dumping of feed wheat in an already glutted feed grain market. Feed grain growers have always been willing to compete with wheatgrowers on a basis of the same rules, but never on a basis of rigged rules. This kind of a dumping opera-

tion would disrupt feed grain livestock ratios to the detriment of livestock, dairy, and poultry producers.

Fifth. Raise the price of flour and bread to consumers. The proponents of the bill say the increase in cost of a sack of flour or a loaf of bread will be small, and the users of flour, including the bakers, say it will be considerable. My judgment would be that the users of flour and bakers of bread are in a much better position to know what the effect on costs in their operations will be. Suffice it to say, however, the larger consumers of flour and bread—many in the lower income bracket—will resent their Government being a part of a rigged program that will increase their basic food costs through a flour or bread tax, even if it should be only 1 cent on a loaf of bread.

Sixth. Permit unlimited discretionary authority to be exercised by the Secretary. If Senators do not believe this, read the original bill carefully and count the number of important areas where the Secretary is granted almost unlimited authority. No industry as important as wheat should be subject to the possibility of some Secretary making political decisions that might be unwise for the whole future of the industry.

Seventh. Cause serious international complications. The President has expressed interest in a high level of international trade. I agree with this objective. The President has also expressed concern about our balance-of-payment problems and potential Common Market restrictions, especially as they relate to agriculture. I am greatly concerned with these problems. But how can we expect to put into effect the rigged multiple-price plan for wheat and not have repercussions, not only in the Common Market countries, but also in other exporting competitor countries such as Canada and Australia?

Eighth. Provide by means of certificates a complicated and little understood plan. It really is a processing tax done up in a new sack. Farmers and others interested in wheat will resist this program because of its complications, uncertainties, and added costs. Bootlegging will be on its way back, not in bottles and jugs, but in sacks and bulk. Whenever the opportunity for a quick buck is available, one will always find some takers. As proof of this, just look at the penalty provisions the proponents have written into the bill. This was also true with prohibition laws, as Senators well remember—and Senators also remember they failed. The door would be wide open for Estes-type scandals when people start dealing in certificates.

Ninth. Finally, and most important, this multiple-price wheat plan would not solve the wheat surplus problem. Furthermore, it would create many new areas of confusion in the entire wheat industry.

The bill before us also contains a provision to extend the present emergency feed grain program for 1 more year—that is, through 1963.

There is serious doubt that an extension of this present stopgap feed grain legislation would save money.

The emergency program now in effect is the most expensive farm program ever enacted by the Congress. This program was abandoned by the administration earlier this year in favor of an approach which has now been rejected by the House.

Under the 1961 feed grain program, the output of corn and grain sorghums was reduced 421 million bushels; but this was partially offset by an increase of 138 million bushels in soybean production. In terms of corn equivalent, the combined 1961 output of corn, grain sorghums, and soybeans was down only 4.3 percent from 1960. Furthermore, the support price—and consequently the potential cost of price support operations—is almost twice as high per bushel for soybeans as for corn.

There is considerable disagreement as to whether the 1961 feed grain program saved money. The answer depends on the assumptions that are made. Assumptions can be selected to yield any desired answer. Those who argue that money was saved are largely relying on unproved estimates of what might have been. For example, in its analysis of the 1961 program, the USDA assumed that only 2.4 bushels of a 7.3-bushel increase in corn yields and 0.8 bushels of a 4-bushel increase in grain sorghum yields resulted from the program, and disregarded an increase of 138 million bushels in soybean production. Even so, it was able to show savings in comparison with the program previously in effect only by assuming that the grain that allegedly would have been produced without the 1961 program would have been stored for 9 years in the case of corn and 11 years in the case of grain sorghums. These assumptions are highly unlikely in light of current upward trend in feed grain consumption.

The July 1, 1962, crop report has been cited as evidence that the emergency program is accomplishing its objective. This report showed a reduction of 3 percent for 1962 production from the final 1961 estimate of corn production, but it should be compared with the July 1961 estimate. On the basis of July 1 crop reports, estimated corn production is up almost 11 percent this year over 1961.

Furthermore, the "emergency" feed grain program and the method in which it has been administered has been devastating to the market system for corn and other feed grains. Under the 1961 feed grain program, the CCC sold over 600 million bushels of corn at an average price of \$1.02 per bushel. At the same time it was selling this corn and depressing the market, a total of 658 million bushels of 1961 corn was placed under price support loans and purchase agreements. This was an alltime high and in excess of the amount put under loan during 1959 and 1960 when the Agricultural Act of 1958 was in operation. There is a good chance that all of the corn sold under the 1961 program will be replaced with new "takeovers" at a support price of \$1.20 per bushel. If this happens, the direct added cost of this manipulation of CCC stocks will be in excess of \$100 million. Additional losses were incurred by selling grain sorghums for less than the support price.

In addition, during the first 9 months of the 1961-62 marketing year, which began last October 1, the farm price of corn averaged 98.1 cents per bushel in comparison with the 1960-61 season average of 99.6 cents per bushel. This happened in spite of the fact that the support price was raised for the 1961 crop from \$1.06 to \$1.20.

It has obviously been the intent of the administration in administering the "emergency" feed grain program to depress market prices for corn and other feed grains. This has been done by selling CCC corn to honor the certificates issued in connection with the program. This was done early in the marketing season in order to hold down market prices and penalize the noncooperators. Such Government action is incomprehensible if one believes in the market system, as I do. If this kind of a program continues, we obviously will not only disrupt the market system for corn and feed grains, but also the market prices of livestock, dairy products, and poultry and eggs. All that is needed is a little more time and this surely will happen.

I would also point out that the cost in the form of direct payments for the 1961 feed grain program approximated \$800 million. The best information I have available at the moment with respect to the 1962 feed grain program is that it will cost in excess of \$900 million. What a price for taxpayers to pay with so little accomplishment.

Now I would like to go back and review briefly the Agricultural Act of 1958 known as Public Law 85-835. This act was passed by a Democratic Congress on a bipartisan basis with a Republican in the White House.

That is the act of 1958, which has been condemned by many. I repeat that this act was passed by a Democratic Congress on a bipartisan basis with a Republican in the White House. To be sure that Members of this body recall how unanimously this bill originally moved through the Senate, I remind Senators that on July 25, 1958, it passed the Senate by a vote of 62 to 11.

Contrary to some statements being made by people that should know better, the Agricultural Act of 1958 covered not only corn and feed grains but also two other very important basic commodities—cotton and rice. I well recall that one of the reasons there was so much support for this act was the fact that rice farmers were faced with an acreage cut of about 40 percent and cotton farmers about a 25-percent cut, if no new legislation were passed. Farmers had also demonstrated by their own action that they were, by a high majority, ignoring corn allotments. Marketing quotas on corn had been removed from the law by the Congress in 1954 because the Congress knew the impossibility of such a program ever being adopted and enforced on feed grain farmers and livestock producers. Primarily because feed grain farmers, cotton farmers, and rice farmers all were faced with real difficulty, there was tremendous support for the 1958 act.

In my judgment, this act has not been wisely administered since the current

Secretary of Agriculture took office. As my southern friends in the body well understand, the support prices were lifted on both cotton and rice in 1961 and for 1962—and, more important, were moved in the opposite direction from that intended by the Congress when it passed the 1958 act. In my opinion, this is one reason why cotton is now in real difficulty, and also the reason why both the cotton and rice programs have become excessively expensive when one takes into consideration the high export subsidy and the lavish use of Public Law 480 giveaway funds in moving these two commodities into export.

As far as feed grains were concerned, Secretary Freeman decided to raise the price support on corn and all other feed grains including oilseeds and was, along with the Congress, also responsible for the enactment of the 1961 emergency feed grain program which, of course, temporarily set aside the 1958 act.

As I said earlier, I voted against this legislation, and I am more convinced today than I was a year ago that it will not solve the problem. In my judgment, if the Agricultural Act of 1958 for feed grains had been permitted to operate during 1961-62—with the terrific increase we have had in corn consumption in this country—we would have been well on our way to a permanent solution of the feed grain problem. Corn price supports would have been reduced and other feed grains reduced similarly, which would have helped increase still further the disappearance of feed grains by livestock producers. The USDA estimates the 1961-62 utilization of corn at 3,933 million bushels, which is more than the 3,908 million bushels produced by the record 1960 crop. We now are consuming and exporting more corn than we have ever produced in a single year, including the years 1959 and 1960, in which corn was supported without any acreage limitation.

In conclusion, I state again very bluntly that what we need is proper administration of the Agricultural Act of 1958 as far as cotton, rice, and feed grains are concerned. If this is done, we have no need for the expensive temporary programs we have had on the statute books in 1961 and 1962.

One other word in order to set the record straight as regards wheat. Many people have erroneously indicated that our wheat problem was brought about by the Agricultural Act of 1958. The truth is that wheat is not dealt with in the Agricultural Act of 1958. The basic wheat program we will revert back to—if the temporary, expensive, and ineffective 1962 "emergency" wheat program is not extended—is the 1938 basic law as far as acreage is concerned and the 1949 law as far as price supports are concerned. Under this law the Secretary has already announced a reduced price support of \$1.82 per bushel for 1963. This move alone means a saving of 18 cents a bushel on every bushel of wheat exported. At the 1961-62 level of exports—710 million bushels—such a reduction in export subsidy costs would result in a saving of \$128 million. In my judgment, this basic legislation is much to be preferred to the complicated

and costly multiple price plan proposed in H.R. 12391.

Most members of the Senate realize that earlier in this session I introduced a bill, S. 2822, along with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and my colleague from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] known as the cropland retirement program. This bill, if enacted into law, would move further in the direction of freedom for individual farmers to make their own decisions in what they plant on their crop acres. It would relate support prices to recent average market prices and would help eliminate much of the cost of current farm programs. In my judgment, such action, together with an extension of the expiring conservation reserve contracts, would help us on our way to a solution of not only the so-called feed grain and wheat problem but also—if used in connection with proper administration of the Agricultural Act of 1958—would go a long way toward solving our problems in the whole agricultural field in a way that would protect farm income. I realize it is too late in this session of Congress to expect this program of mine to be enacted this year. I would suggest, however, that we not muddy up the water further by passing the current bill before us, H.R. 12391, but rather vote it down. We would then revert back to the basic legislation, and, in my judgment, would be much better off than if we adopted this costly, ineffective bill now before us.

Mr. President, in connection with the proposal to reconsider the amendment which was made awhile ago, which has been previously discussed, a great many Senators were absent from the Chamber at the time the amendment was agreed to. I earnestly hope, in the interests of satisfactory procedure, since this has been done time and time again in the Senate procedure, because there were so few Senators present at the time the amendment was adopted, that we can avoid any long controversy about reconsideration of the amendment, about tabling a motion to reconsider, or procedural matters of that kind. I appeal to my friends in charge of the bill to see if they cannot voluntarily—in the interests of permitting every Senator to know about this issue and to have an opportunity to vote on it—consent to a reconsideration of the vote on the amendment, without going through the mechanics of repeated voting, so that all Senators will be satisfied and be put on notice as to the vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider the vote by which the Ellender amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to detain the Senate very long. Yesterday I delivered a speech which emphasized the reason for the adoption of such an amendment as was adopted by the Senate.

I was not too well impressed by the arguments made by my good friends from South Dakota and Nebraska. They admit that, in order for the Secretary of Agriculture to be in a position

to do the evil things they contend he might do, he would have to come to Congress and ask Congress to give him such power.

The sole purpose of the amendment is merely to remove that portion of the 1958 act which makes it obligatory on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture to support the prices of corn, sorghum, and other feed grains at 65 percent of parity or at 90 percent of the average price for the previous 3 years, without any limitation as to quantity to be produced. That is the purpose of it. I so stated when it was submitted. I am glad that my good friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] favors the amendment that I offered.

In the meantime, if the farmers of the country desire legislation, they can have it. They can appeal to the Senators and Representatives. But I emphasize that the Secretary of Agriculture will be unable in any manner to control the acreage to be planted to corn and other feed grains unless Congress gives him the authority to do so in the future.

Before the amendment was agreed to there was a quorum call. I think the measure has been sufficiently debated. I am sure every Senator knows what it is all about, and there would be no point in rehashing it. Therefore, I move to table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his motion?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I withhold the motion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator from Louisiana have any alarm at the thought of placing in one man, the Secretary of Agriculture, the great power of determining, within the range of 0 to 90 percent, what amount shall be paid to the farmers? I cannot conclude that we ought to assign to one individual, regardless of how good he may be and how genuine his motives, the great power of telling the farmers of the Nation, "I will determine what price support you shall get. I will determine, if I deem it advisable, to give you nothing. I will have to do so especially if price supports would increase the amount of corn and thus add to the quantity of corn held by the Commodity Credit Corporation."

Should we give to one man who is politically minded, as I am, such great power?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, that power has been given to the Secretary of Agriculture in the past. It was given in the 1949 act. The Secretary now has the power to fix the price supports on soybeans as well as other commodities. He has that power now. What I wish again to emphasize to the Senate is that corn producers seem to get the best of everything by way of price supports without limitation. Mr. President, it seems to me there should be no objection on the part of the producers of corn to curtailing their acreage in order to get a fair price support. It would do for corn the same as we do for cotton and other commodities.

We are told that we cannot deal with corn as we deal with cotton and other commodities because 85 percent of the corn is fed on the farm. I have heard that argument ever since I first came to the Senate. Yet we have in storage more than 2½ billion bushels of corn and other feed grains, at great cost to the taxpayer.

What I am trying to do is to change the law which forces the Secretary of Agriculture to provide price supports on unlimited production when we have those products running out of our ears at present. That is the whole issue.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I recognize the cost of this farm program. But I also recognize that throughout the years changes have been made in attempts to cure what was wrong only to find that with every wrong cured, two or three new problems were created.

I now get to the basic proposition. Regardless of what is contained in other laws, is it wise to give to one man, with political concepts or without them, the great power of determining, without any floor or ceiling, what he may do in dealing with the farmers of the Nation? That is the problem that confronts me. Based upon what I have seen of the use of power in high public office, I am becoming more and more impressed with the precept that I heard years ago: Put a leash on your public officials. Give them only limited power. Do not allow them, according to their whims, caprices and fancies, to determine what laws should be. The Constitution has provided that the Congress shall pass the law and fix the ceiling and floor of price support.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what the Congress is doing in the proposed legislation. Someone must administer the program. We give the power to the head of the Department of Agriculture to administer the program, as we have in the past.

In the case of wheat the Secretary of Agriculture cannot say what price shall be offered. It is fixed in the act from 75 to 90 percent of parity, and depending on the supply on hand, he can vary the support price. But the yardstick is spelled out. It is fixed in the law. I wish to be perfectly frank with Senators. The Secretary of Agriculture will be absolutely and positively powerless to control in any manner the production of corn and other feed grains if the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I agree with the last statement of the Senator. However, that does not mean that Congress cannot do something about the problem.

Mr. ELLENDER. It would have to be done by the Congress.

Mr. MILLER. That is correct. It is said that the Secretary would really be powerless. That is true, but that is one reason why we have the Congress to do something about it. I cannot see the purpose of the Senator's argument. It is

still the responsibility of Congress to do something about the situation.

Under the 1958 act, roughly, the support price for corn would be around \$1.04 to \$1.06. If we take 65 percent of parity, which is \$1.60, we would get \$1.04; at 90 percent of the average for the last 3 years we would get \$1.06. Does the Senator think that that amount of price support is unreasonable?

Mr. ELLENDER. Without production controls yes. Farmers produce in abundance. As I pointed out yesterday, in 1960, before the emergency programs were placed on the statute books, we had accumulated 84.7 million tons of corn and other feed grains.

Through the first emergency program, in 1961, we reduce it to 73 million tons. In 1962, this year, we expect to reduce it to 61.3 million tons, and about 1963, if the bill goes through and the emergency program is reinstated, there will be in my opinion a further reduction to 49.6 million tons, about the amount we had on hand in 1956, which may be more nearly a normal carryover.

Mr. MILLER. I am not sure what the tonnage figures are, but I believe the Senator's tonnage figures related to feed grains. His present amendment relates to corn. That is what I am really interested in. As I understand the situation from our colloquy of yesterday, we now have on hand about 1.6 billion bushels of corn.

Mr. ELLENDER. We also have on hand 700 million bushels of sorghums, 276 million bushels of oats, and 122 million bushels of barley.

Mr. MILLER. My point is that we are talking about corn.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. I am interested in the corn farmer. What the Senator is saying is that we now have on hand 1.6 billion bushels of corn.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. That is about a 5-month supply, according to the Department of Agriculture. I tried to elicit this information from the Senator yesterday. What I am trying to find out whether he, the Secretary of Agriculture, or the President, has a target with respect to the amount that we should have on hand. From all the arguments I have heard thus far on this subject, I did not know but that 1.6 billion bushels might be exactly the right amount. There are some in the Defense Department who feel that we ought to have a 5- or 6-month reserve of feed on hand.

So I come back to my original question of yesterday: What are we trying to do? What does the Senator want to do? He is talking about surpluses. I recognize that we have surpluses. The question is, Should we reduce the surplus of corn below 1.6 billion bushels, or is it all right? If we should reduce it, by how much should we reduce it?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I pointed out yesterday to my good friend from Iowa, in 1950 the amount of corn on hand was 844 million bushels, with nearly 60 million bushels of grain sorghums on hand. Today we have on hand 1,650 million bushels of corn and

grain sorghums. To me that is excessive. We must keep on hand all of this excess at a great cost to the Government. As I pointed out in the RECORD—and I placed a great many tables in the RECORD yesterday—corn and other feed grains and wheat cost the taxpayers \$900 million a year to store.

Mr. WILEY. For storage.

Mr. ELLENDER. For storage. I am trying to get rid of it.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator please tell us, when he uses the word "excessive," how excessive he thinks it is? Is the excess 1 bushel or what?

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator any idea what it ought to be?

Mr. MILLER. There are some in the Defense Department who think there should be a 6-month reserve.

Mr. ELLENDER. In case of war, that is correct. What I should like to do is to have the Senate adopt this proposal, and then return in January and do something about it. Let me again emphasize that 3 years ago, when we tried to deal with corn and wheat, we adopted an emergency program, so that in the meantime we could draft suitable legislation. We have had to renew the emergency programs from year to year. Up to the present we have not provided permanent legislation. That is what I hope to do by the adoption of the amendment.

So far as I am concerned, I will never again vote for these emergency programs unless at the end of the emergency there is permanent legislation. That is what I am trying to provide. I tried to do it in May by offering a permanent program, and I was successful. The Senate voted for it. However, we were stymied in the House. I wish the Senate to go along with me now, and adopt the same kind of program that I advocated last May. However, I am a realist, as I said yesterday. Although I would like such a provision, I know what we are confronted with in the House, and I know it would encounter severe opposition there and we could not enact a bill containing such a provision.

However, by the adoption of the amendment the emergency program would be extended for another year and we would reduce the carryover to about 49.6 million tons of corn and other feed grains, which might be normal, and might represent a 4½- or 5-month carryover.

Mr. MILLER. Is the Senator answering my question regarding the objective?

Mr. ELLENDER. We would leave it in the hands of the farmers or producers to keep the production in line with what the needs are, and not let Uncle Sam carry the expense, as he is now doing. We must consider not only the farmers, but also the taxpayers. As I pointed out yesterday, the RECORD is replete with tables that were placed in it, which indicate the great cost of this program to the taxpayers. It is time now to stop it.

Mr. MILLER. I am completely sympathetic with the Senator's concern about so-called emergency legislation. I do not like the word "emergency." I would like to see us get some permanent legislation on the books. However, that

does not necessarily mean that we must adopt this particular amendment. There are other ways of handling it. One is to have no bill and go back to the 1958 law. What I am still trying to find out, and what I believe other Members of the Senate are still trying to find out, is what the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry say is the proper objective with respect to surpluses?

Mr. ELLENDER. We will find it out for the Senator in January when hearings are held on the program. I do not know. The Senator knows as well as I do what the carryover ought to be. I do not know, of course.

Mr. MILLER. If the Senator does not know—

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out the other day, under the law when the corn provision was enacted, it was thought that a reasonable carryover was 15 percent of our domestic consumption and our exports. In the case of rice it was 10 percent of our exports and domestic consumption. In the case of cotton, it was 30 percent. It may be that if and when we consider permanent legislation for corn we may raise the limitation of 15 percent to perhaps 20 percent or 25 percent. I do not know.

Mr. MILLER. If the Senator does not know—and I certainly do not know either—it seems to me that the Secretary of Agriculture ought at least to give us his recommendation before we start operating on such drastic legislation as that now before the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. In the amendment we propose we ask the Secretary to get in touch with the farmers and with all those engaged in agriculture and try to find out for us what legislation would best suit their purposes.

I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question for the purpose of clarification. His amendment has two paragraphs, (a) and (b). The first paragraph relates to the permanent support provisions for corn. The second paragraph reads:

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to consult and advise with farmers, farm organizations, and such other persons or groups of persons as he determines concerning the need for new legislation for feed grains, to the extent he deems such consultation and advice necessary or desirable, and to make specific recommendations for feed grains in the form of proposed legislation which shall be submitted to the Congress as soon as practicable during the next session of Congress.

Inasmuch as paragraph (a) provides what might be considered to be permanent legislation with respect to the price support level for corn, am I correct in assuming that paragraph (b) relates primarily to other feed grains, such as sorghum, oats, and barley?

Mr. ELLENDER. It deals with all the feed grains.

Mr. AIKEN. And their relation to corn?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the motion to reconsider.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. On the motion to table, a vote "yea" is a vote to refuse to reconsider the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. A vote "nay" is a vote to reconsider the amendment on its merits?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the motion to reconsider. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senators from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS and Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON and Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senators from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. BOGGS] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORRON] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORROW]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 23, as follows:

[No. 209 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Aiken	Hill	Monroney
Bartlett	Holland	Morse
Burdick	Humphrey	Moss
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Neuberger
Cannon	Johnston	Pell
Case	Jordan, N.C.	Prouty
Chavez	Keating	Randolph
Dodd	Kefauver	Robertson
Douglas	Kerr	Russell
Eastland	Long, Mo.	Smith, Mass.
Ellender	Long, Hawaii	Smith, Maine
Engle	Long, La.	Sparkman
Ervin	Magnuson	Stennis
Fong	Mansfield	Talmadge
Fulbright	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Gore	McClellan	Yarborough
Hart	McGee	Young, Ohio
Hartke	McNamara	
Hayden	Metcalf	

NAYS—23

Beall	Dirksen	Pearson
Bennett	Goldwater	Proxmire
Bottum	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bush	Hruska	Thurmond
Capehart	Jordan, Idaho	Tower
Carlson	Lausche	Wiley
Cooper	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Curtis	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—19

Allott	Clark	Pastore
Anderson	Cotton	Scott
Bible	Gruening	Smathers
Boggs	Hickey	Symington
Butler	Kuchel	Williams, Del.
Carroll	Morton	
Church	Murphy	

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to the committee amendment, as amended, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The amendment of the Senator from Illinois, to the committee amendment, as amended, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, as amended, on page 55, after line 19, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 304. The Commodity Credit Corporation shall not sell corn or other feed grains in CCC stocks for unrestricted use at a price less than the 1962 price-support level plus all carrying charges.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this amendment is very simple. It merely hobbles the Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to the price at which it may put corn and feed grains on the

market. It provides, in the case of corn or its equivalent in feed grains, a price of \$1.20, plus carrying charges; \$1.20 happens to be the 1962 price support price. So I want all Senators to know precisely what the amendment does.

Mr. President, there is a reason for the amendment. When the Secretary of Agriculture appeared before the House committee in February, he there unfurled the so-called ABCD program, which was the program for abundance, balance, conservation, and development; and in connection with that program, the Secretary made a statement. I now read from pages 16 and 17 of his statement, as follows:

Under our recommended program for wheat, as for feed grains, marketing quotas and acreage allotments would be established, land would be diverted to conservation usage, quotas would not go into effect until approved by two-thirds of the producers, and supports would be available only if quotas are approved. The reduction of stocks held by the Government would be reduced by the producers themselves if they approve the quota. If they did not approve such quota any stock reduction would have to depend on Government action, and the CCC would therefore be authorized to sell up to 10 million tons in the case of feed grains and up to 200 million bushels in the case of wheat.

Mr. President, those are not my words; that is what Secretary Freeman stated on February 7, when he was testifying before the House committee, and that is what he stated at the time when he said that "unless it is democratically approved by two-thirds of the producers," the Commodity Credit Corporation would have authority under that original bill to dump 10 million tons of feed grains and 200 million bushels of wheat.

Mr. President, I cannot imagine a greater bludgeon to be put into the hands of any administrative officer of this Government than the right to dump upon the market, without restraint, whatever we had in stocks, at a price which he might determine, a price which in his opinion was best suited to the situation confronting him.

All this amendment does is to say, "Do not sell for less than the 1962 support price"; and that equates at \$1.20 a bushel, plus the carrying charge, on corn. Without this amendment, a sword of Damocles would hang over the producers. They would be confronted with a bludgeon or a threat. They would be told, "Either two-thirds of you vote for this"—under what the Secretary calls the democratic process—"or I am going to dump this stuff on the market, and I am going to beat down the price level, and you will wish to your dying day you had accepted my proposition."

That is the thing that has affronted the producers of the country. To take that kind of approach reminds me of the ditty we heard back in 1898. When we were having trouble with Aguinaldo in the Philippines, somebody wrote a little ditty. I have forgotten most of it, but one line I have never forgotten, because it went, "And civilize them with a Krag."

A Krag was one of the most modern rifles at that time. That was the way to civilize them. Either get rid of the surpluses by the "democratic" process

and enslave themselves by a two-thirds vote, or else the Department wants authority to dump up to 10 million bushels of feed grains and 2 million bushels of wheat. What a weapon in the hands of an administrative officer in a free land.

I want to say, with respect to the amendment, if the Secretary or the Commodity Credit Corporation is going to sell the commodities, then he or it will have to sell them at not less than the support price for 1962, which is \$1.20 a bushel, plus carrying charges. It is very simple.

On the amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois may not have to have a rolloall, because I am going to offer a substitute which may be acceptable to the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not think the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois is quite as acceptable as some of my colleagues may think for things are not always what they seem. I must say, after the last vote, I think anyone will be excused for being a bit confused, because I never expected to see a vote in which all but two Democrats voted for flexible supports from 0 to 90 percent of parity and all but seven Republicans voted for a high minimum support price, which our leadership has opposed for the last 20 years. Nevertheless, we have seen it.

The effect of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois would be to raise corn prices to the highest level they have reached in recent years. Much of the corn which the Commodity Credit Corporation has on hand was acquired at \$1.06 a bushel, which was the support price up to last year. Then Secretary Freeman, unwisely, raised the support price to \$1.20 a bushel.

The amendment of the Senator from Illinois would prohibit sales of corn, regardless of when acquired, at less than \$1.20 plus carrying charges. Unfortunately, the farmer for years has not received support prices for his corn. All last fall, farmers were selling corn at 90 cents to a dollar a bushel, just as they had the previous year. After it got out of the farmer's hands, the price got up to \$1.12 or \$1.15. Dealers cannot be expected to handle it for nothing. The latest price is \$1.13 a bushel.

I am afraid that, under the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, the price would go up to nearly \$1.40 a bushel.

I do not approve of the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Secretary of Agriculture breaking the market for corn growers or other farm producers, but I believe if they were prohibited from selling corn on hand for less than \$1.20 plus carrying charges, the price of corn would skyrocket. It would be felt by every poultryman, every livestock grower, every dairyman in the country, and the increased cost would have to come out of his pocket or it would have to be added to the price to the consumer.

While I have felt the Department has abused its authority from time to time, yet we do not want to legislate such abuses—or perhaps I should call them

advantages—into the law. It certainly would have no other effect than to increase the consumer's cost and the cost of the livestock grower, the dairymen, and the poultry growers of America.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thought I had given up the floor.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask the distinguished minority leader, as a matter of making sure what the legislative intent is, whether the price support he refers to means the support price for No. 1 corn. For example, would it be \$1.20 for No. 1 corn, but would the support price for older corn be less? Is it the intention of the Senator from Illinois that that would be the basis, rather than \$1.20 on all corn?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would be worked out on a formula basis by the Department.

Mr. MILLER. But it would definitely be based on the grade of corn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I anticipated that such an amendment would be offered. As a matter of fact, I would have attempted to offer it myself. I see what could happen to the market price of corn and feed grains if the carryover was such a large amount and the Secretary could sell at his will, whatever the market value was.

I am going to suggest to the Senator from Illinois that he modify his amendment to conform with my own. Otherwise, I will offer it. It would read as follows:

Effective with the beginning of the marketing year for the 1964 crop of such commodity, the minimum sales price for sales of corn, oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums from stocks of Commodity Credit Corporation shall be 65 per centum of the parity price for such commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year, plus reasonable carrying charges.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator express it in terms of prices?

Mr. ELLENDER. That would be about \$1.04 or \$1.06 a bushel.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not pick this figure out of the air. I geared it to the price support level for 1962. I did not determine the level. It was determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was a special price in order to have some acres diverted. It was just a little honey that the Secretary of Agriculture extended in order to encourage more diverted acres. I believe 65 percent would be fair, since most of the corn now on hand was taken at a figure of 65 percent of parity.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I must say my distinguished friend from Louisiana uses a most engaging term when he uses the word "honey." That club had to have a lot of honey on it when it was being gotten ready to be used as a bludgeon. But what about the carrying charge?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest the Senator read it again for the benefit of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. It reads:

Effective with the beginning of the marketing year for the 1964 crop of such commodity, the minimum sales price for sales

of corn, oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums from stocks of Commodity Credit Corporation shall be 65 per centum of the parity price for such commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year, plus reasonable carrying charges.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That gives the Secretary some latitude about what the carrying charge is, because we envision the carrying charge as a charge including storage. He may well say, "I do not propose to pay out that much. I think so much per bushel should be paid." Yet it might be an unreasonable concept because the actual cost might be more than that.

I should like to have the legislative record made, to see how this equates in terms of dollars and cents.

Mr. ELLENDER. The 65 percent would be about \$1.04, or \$1.06. Then there would be added the "reasonable carrying charges."

All I did was to copy what is now in the law. The Senator well knows that a good deal of corn and other feed grains have been in storage 4 or 5 years. If one were to add all of those charges, it would make the price of corn go up considerably. That is why we have in the law the word "reasonable," so that the circumstances can be taken into consideration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not think that club Mr. Freeman was going to wield all around the place was very reasonable, because I could not see sweet reason in getting bashed over the head with a club when he dumped the feed grains and corn on the market and said, "Take that or leave it."

Mr. ELLENDER. I have the utmost of faith in my good friend Orville Freeman. I think he wants to do a good job. I think he wants to assist the farmers. I do not think there is any question about it. I believe his effort is to try to educate the public.

After all, the farmer does not get all of the profits which come from these high prices. The middlemen are getting a lot of them.

I am willing to trust the Secretary to do a good job under this provision.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I feel my own spirit is a little wanting, and I may be charged as a sinner whose faith quotient is not quite so high, when it comes to Brother Freeman. That is not personal. That is only in respect to administrative actions he takes and in respect to proposals he advances to the Congress.

Mr. President, I will not quarrel about it. I am willing to accept this language as a substitute, in the hope that if it needs some further tinkering, that can be done, probably, in conference, if the bill gets to conference, or in the House of Representatives.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask if the amendment, as modified, would cover grain out of condition or threatening to go out of condition?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as I understand, even the proposed modification of the amendment, by the Senator from

Louisiana, would have the effect of raising the price of corn something like 10 cents a bushel above the present market price. I wish to have the RECORD show that I do not think it would be wise to raise the price of corn above the present market price. I have received no complaint from farmers about the price of corn, which is, I think, \$1.13 a bushel today. This proposal would make it \$1.05 a bushel plus carrying charges, which would be perhaps another 15 or 20 cents.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I concur in the substitute and I withdraw my own amendment, and I ask that the order for the yeas and nays be withdrawn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to say that the amendment, which is now the result of some conciliation and deliberation among the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Vermont, and the Senator from Louisiana, is much needed, particularly with the extension of the voluntary program, because if there should be dumping, it could be very injurious to the market and to the producers.

The amendment is a reasonable one. I am hopeful that it will be accepted by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request to withdraw the order for the yeas and nays? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. I send forward the amendment, as a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 55, after line 19, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 304. The Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting after the third sentence of section 407 the following: "Effective with the beginning of the marketing year for the 1964 crop of such commodity, the minimum sales price for sales of corn, oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums from the stocks of Commodity Credit Corporation shall be 65 per centum of the parity price for such commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year, plus reasonable carrying charges."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana would not take effect for 2 years, it would be more acceptable than the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, which had no effective date. It is a certainty that we shall have at least two more farm bills presented to Congress before 1964. It is also probable, considering the shrinking supply of feed grains in this country and the intent to shrink them still further, that the market price might increase by 1964 to the amount which is designated in the modification of the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

While I would not wish to have the RECORD show I am voting for the amendment, it is not so harmful as it appeared at first glance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ment offered by the Senator from Illinois, as modified, to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there are several other amendments to be offered. I visited with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who wishes to offer a key amendment, a very important amendment.

I should like to propound the unanimous-consent request that upon the Mundt amendment, to be offered, there be 1 hour of time, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Louisiana, and, of course, that the unanimous-consent request carry with it the rule of germaneness, as is typical in unanimous-consent requests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I agreed with the acting majority leader as to the limitation of time on my amendment. The Senator did not identify the amendment in question, but the amendment he had in mind, I am sure—and the amendment I had in mind—was my amendment 8-17-62—H.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator send the amendment to the desk?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. But before sending amendment H to the desk, I call up my amendment 8-17-62—G.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 52, line 19, after the word "from" it is proposed to insert "erosion."

On page 72, between lines 8 and 9, it is proposed to insert the following: "including provision for the control of erosion."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the amendment I have called up is not the amendment on which there has been an agreement to limit the time for debate. The amendment before us now would provide that, with respect to the retired acres, among the other considerations which the owner or the operator of the land shall undertake to fulfill, along with insect control, weed control, and so forth, would be erosion control. The amendment would add the words "including provision for the control of erosion."

The Senate accepted that in the bill previously considered. I think the chairman of the committee is willing to accept it now. If so, we will not have need for further discussion.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand the amendment, it is the same one the Senate adopted when the Senate considered S. 3225.

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no objection, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I now call up my amendment 8-17-62—H. This is the amendment on which there is a limitation of debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 56, between lines 3 and 4, it is proposed to insert the first alternate program—sections 310 through 325.

On page 66, between lines 21 and 22, it is proposed to insert the following:

(b) In the referendum held pursuant to subsection (a) of this section on the national marketing quota proclaimed for the 1963 crop of wheat, the Secretary shall also submit the question whether farmers favor a two-year extension of the program in effect for the 1962 crop of wheat in lieu of the program for wheat provided by sections 310 through 325 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. If a majority of the farmers voting on such question favor such two-year extension, (1) the provisions of sections 310 through 325 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 shall thereupon become inoperative, (2) the provisions of sections 326 through 329 of such Act shall be in effect for the 1963 and 1964 crops, and (3) the provisions of law in effect without regard to the amendments contained in such Act shall be in effect for the 1965 and subsequent crops of wheat.

On page 91, between lines 7 and 8, it is proposed to insert the second alternate program—sections 326 through 329 as follows:

Sec. 326. (a) If a majority of the farmers voting on the question submitted pursuant to section 336(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, added by section 316 of this Act, favor a two-year extension of the program in effect for the 1962 crop of wheat, the provisions of sections 326 through 329 of this Act shall be in effect in lieu of the provisions of sections 310 through 325.

(b) Section 334(c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding a new subparagraph (3) to read as follows:

"(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each old or new farm acreage allotment for the 1963 and 1964 crops of wheat as determined on the basis of a minimum national acreage allotment of fifty-five million acres shall be reduced by 10 per centum."

Sec. 327. (a) In lieu of the provisions of item (1) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1340(1)), the following provisions shall apply to the 1963 and 1964 crops of wheat:

"(1) If a national marketing quota for wheat is in effect for the marketing year, farm marketing quotas shall be in effect for the crop of wheat which is normally harvested in the calendar year in which such marketing year begins. The farm marketing quota for such crop of wheat shall be the actual production of the acreage planted to such crop of wheat on the farm less the farm marketing excess. The farm marketing excess shall be an amount equal to twice the normal yield of wheat per acre established for the farm multiplied by the number

of acres of such crop of wheat on the farm in excess of the farm acreage allotment for such crop unless the producer, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary and within the time prescribed therein, establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary the actual production of such crop of wheat on the farm. If such actual production is so established, the farm marketing excess shall be such actual production less the actual production of the farm wheat acreage allotment based upon the average yield per acre for the entire wheat acreage on the farm: *Provided, however*, That the farm marketing excess shall not be larger than the amount by which the actual production, so established, exceeds the normal production of the farm wheat acreage allotment."

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of item (2) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1340(2)), the rate of penalty on wheat of the 1963 and 1964 crops shall be 65 per centum of the parity price per bushel of wheat as of May 1 of the calendar year in which such crop is harvested.

(c) In lieu of the provisions of item (3) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1340(3)), the following provisions shall apply to the 1963 and 1964 crops of wheat:

"(3) The farm marketing excess for wheat shall be regarded as available for marketing, and the penalty and the storage amount or amounts of wheat to be delivered to the Secretary shall be computed upon twice the normal production of the excess acreage. If the farm marketing excess so computed is adjusted downward on the basis of actual production as heretofore provided the difference between the amount of the penalty or storage computed on the basis of twice the normal production and as computed on actual production shall be returned to or allowed the producer or a corresponding adjustment made in the amount to be delivered to the Secretary if the producer elects to make such delivery. The Secretary shall issue regulations under which the farm marketing excess of wheat for the farm shall be stored or delivered to him. Upon failure to store, or deliver to the Secretary, the farm marketing excess within such time as may be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary the penalty computed as aforesaid shall be paid by the producer. Any wheat delivered to the Secretary hereunder shall become the property of the United States and shall be disposed of by the Secretary for relief purposes in the United States for friendly foreign countries or in such other manner as he shall determine will divert it from the normal channels of trade and commerce."

(d) Item (7) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1340(7)), is amended to read as follows:

"(7) A farm marketing quota on any crop of wheat shall not be applicable to any farm on which, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, the actual acreage planted to wheat for harvest of such crop does not exceed fifteen acres: *Provided, however*, That a farm marketing quota on the 1962, 1963, and 1964 crops of wheat shall be applicable to any farm on which the acreage of wheat exceeds the smaller of (1) thirteen and five-tenths acres, or (2) the highest number of acres actually planted to wheat on the farm for harvest in any of the calendar years 1959, 1960, or 1961."

(e) Section 336 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1336), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision hereof, (1) if the Secretary determines that two-thirds or more of the farmers voting in the referendum on marketing quotas held pursuant to section 336 (a) of this Act, as amended by section 416

of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, approve marketing quotas for the 1963 crop of wheat, marketing quotas shall be in effect for the 1963 crop of wheat, and (2) farmers who have not produced in excess of thirteen and five-tenths acres of wheat in at least one of the years 1959, 1960, or 1961, shall not be eligible to vote in the referendum conducted with respect to the national marketing quota for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1964."

SEC. 328. Price support for the 1963 and 1964 crops of wheat shall be made available as provided in section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, except that price support shall be made available only to co-operators, only in the commercial wheat-producing area, and if marketing quotas are in effect for the crop of wheat, wheat of such crop shall be eligible for price support only if the producers on the farm on which the wheat is produced participate in the special wheat program formulated under section 329 to the extent prescribed by the Secretary.

SEC. 329. (a) If marketing quotas are in effect for the 1963 or 1964 crop of wheat, producers on any farm, except a farm on which a new farm wheat allotment is established for the crop, in the commercial wheat-producing area shall be entitled to payments determined as provided in subsection (b) upon compliance with the conditions hereinafter prescribed:

(1) Such producers shall divert from the production of wheat an acreage on the farm equal to either (i) 10 per centum of the highest actual acreage of wheat planted on the farm for harvest in any of the years 1959, 1960, or 1961: *Provided*, That such acreage in each of such years did not exceed fifteen acres, or (ii) 10 per centum of the farm acreage allotment for the crop of wheat which would be in effect except for the reduction thereof as provided in section 334(c) (3) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

(2) Such diverted acreage shall be devoted to conservation uses including summer fallow, approved by the Secretary, and such measures shall be taken as the Secretary may deem appropriate to keep such diverted acreage free from erosion, insects, weeds, and rodents: *Provided*, That such diverted acreage may be devoted to castor beans, guar, safflower, sunflower, or sesame, if designated by the Secretary, subject to the condition that no payment shall be made with respect to diverted acreage devoted to any such commodity.

(3) The total acreage of cropland on the farm devoted to soil-conserving uses, including summer fallow and idle land, but excluding the acreage diverted as provided above and acreage diverted under the special program for feed grains, shall not be less than the total average acreage of cropland devoted to soil-conserving uses including summer fallow and idle land on the farm in 1959 and 1960. Certification by the producer with respect to such acreage may be accepted as evidence of compliance with the foregoing provision. The total average acreage devoted to soil-conserving uses, including summer fallow and idle land, in 1959 and 1960, shall be subject to adjustment to the extent the Secretary determines appropriate for abnormal weather conditions or other factors affecting production, established crop-rotation practices on the farm, changes in the constitution of the farm, participation in other Federal farm programs, or to give effect to the provisions of law relating to release and reapportionment or preservation of history.

(4) If the diversion of acreage is made pursuant to the provisions of (1) (i) of this subsection (a), the actual acreage of wheat planted on the farm for harvest shall not exceed 90 per centum of the highest actual acreage of wheat planted on the farm for harvest in any of the years 1959, 1960, or

1961; and if the diversion of acreage is made pursuant to the provisions of (1) (ii) of this subsection (a), the farm shall be in compliance with the farm wheat acreage allotment.

(b) (1) Upon compliance with the conditions prescribed in subsection (a) producers on the farm shall be entitled to payments which shall be made by Commodity Credit Corporation in cash or wheat equal to 45 per centum of the value, at the estimated basic county support rate per bushel for Number 1 wheat for the county in which the farm is considered as being located for the administration of farm marketing quotas for wheat, of the number of bushels equal to the adjusted yield per acre of wheat for the farm, multiplied by the number of diverted acres other than acres devoted to castor beans, guar, safflower, sunflower, or sesame.

(2) The Secretary may make such adjustments in yields for the 1959 and 1960 crop years as he determines necessary to correct for abnormal factors affecting production, and to give due consideration to tillable acreage, crop rotation practices, type of soil, soil and water conservation measures, and topography. To the extent that a producer proves the actual yields for the farm for the 1959 and 1960 crop years, such yields shall be used in making determinations.

(3) The Secretary shall provide by regulations for the sharing of payments among producers on the farm on a fair and equitable basis. The medium of payment shall be determined by the Secretary. If payments are made in wheat, the value of the payments in cash shall be converted to wheat at the market price of wheat as determined by Commodity Credit Corporation. Wheat received as payment-in-kind may be marketed without penalty but shall not be eligible for price support.

(c) (1) Producers who divert acreage on the farm under subsection (a) may divert additional acreage on the farm not in excess of the larger of three times the amount diverted under subsection (a) or such acreage as will bring the total acreage diverted to ten acres: *Provided*, That the total acreage diverted under subsection (a) and this subsection (c) shall not exceed the larger of (i) the highest actual acreage of wheat planted on the farm for harvest for any of the years 1959, 1960, 1961, but not to exceed ten acres or (ii) the wheat acreage allotment.

(2) Payments shall be made with respect to the acreage diverted under this subsection (c) in accordance with the terms and conditions prescribed in subsection (a): *Provided*, That (i) 60 per centum shall be substituted for 45 per centum in computing the amount of the payment, (ii) the acreage diverted under this subsection (c) shall be added to and deemed to be acreage diverted under subsection (a) for the purposes of paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a), and (iii) if the diversion under subsection (a) is made pursuant to (1) (i) of said subsection, the actual acreage planted to wheat for harvest on the farm, shall be reduced below the highest actual acreage of wheat planted on the farm for harvest in any of the years 1959, 1960, or 1961, by the total amount of acres diverted under subsection (a) and this subsection (c), or, if the diversion under subsection (a) is made pursuant to (1) (ii) of said subsection, the wheat acreage on the farm shall be reduced by the total amount of acres diverted under subsection (a) and this subsection (c) below whichever of the following acreages is the larger—

(A) the farm acreage allotment for the crop of wheat which would be in effect except for the reduction thereof as provided in section 334(c) (3) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

(B) the highest actual acreage of wheat planted on the farm for harvest for any of

the years 1959, 1960, or 1961, but not to exceed fifteen acres.

(d) Any acreage diverted from the production of wheat to conservation uses for which payment is made under the program formulated pursuant to this section shall be in addition to any acreage diverted to conservation uses for which payment is made under any other Federal program except that the foregoing shall not preclude the making of cost-sharing payments under the agricultural conservation program or the Great Plains program for conservation practices carried out on any acreage devoted to soil-conserving uses under the program formulated pursuant to this section.

(e) The Secretary may provide for adjusting any payment on account of failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the program formulated under this section.

(f) Not to exceed 50 per centum of any payment to producers under this section may be made in advance of determination of performance.

(g) The program formulated pursuant to this section may include such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically provided for herein, as the Secretary determines are desirable to effectuate the purposes of this section.

(h) Wheat stored to avoid or postpone a marketing quota penalty under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended and supplemented, shall not be released from storage for underplanting based upon acreage diverted under subsection (c) above, and in determining production of the crop of wheat for the purpose of releasing wheat from storage on account of underproduction the normal yield of the acres diverted from the allotment shall be deemed to be actual production of wheat.

(i) The Secretary is authorized to promulgate such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

(j) The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to utilize its capital funds and other assets for the purpose of making the payments authorized herein and to pay administrative expenses necessary in carrying out this section during the period ending June 30, 1963. There is authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to pay such administrative expenses.

(k) Section 334(e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to increased allotments for durum wheat, is amended—

(1) by striking out "after reduction in the case of the 1962 crop as required by section 334(c) (2)" and inserting the following: "after reduction as required by section 334 (c) (2) or (3)", and

(2) by striking out "the special 1962 wheat program formulated under section 124 of the Agricultural Act of 1961" and inserting the following: "the special wheat program for such crop formulated under section 124 of the Agricultural Act of 1961 or section 329 of the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962".

(l) Section 334(i) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to increased allotments in the Tulare area in California, is amended—

(1) by inserting the following sentence immediately following the seventh sentence thereof: "The special wheat program formulated under section 329 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 shall not be applicable to any farm receiving an additional allotment under this subsection."; and

(2) by striking out of the last sentence the following: "or 1963".

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered deals exclusively with the wheat section of the bill. It is exactly the same as the amendment which I offered when the

Senate had before it the farm bill several months ago, at which time the committee reported the proposed legislation to the Senate with my so-called free choice amendment included. However, on motion in the Senate by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senate subsequently knocked the amendment from the bill. I offer the amendment now because it seems to me that this is one of the crucial and key issues which confront us.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may we have order so that the Senator from South Dakota may proceed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, my so-called free choice amendment would give the wheat farmers of America a right in their referendum to determine which of two wheat programs they prefer. H.R. 12391, now before the Senate, contains an entirely new wheat program which has never been tried or tested by the farmers of America. It is a wheat program which has been discussed from time to time as far back as the early 1920's. It is a modification of what used to be called a two-price system. The proposal is actually a three- or four-price system. But it is based upon the fundamentals conceived at the time two-price legislation was discussed by Congress.

There has never been a wheat program as coercive in nature and as mandatory in purpose as the proposals contained in H.R. 12391. The proposal has considerable support in the Wheat Belt, and it has considerable opposition in the Wheat Belt. However, there is considerable confusion and misunderstanding on the part of both supporters and opponents of the proposal. There is considerable apprehension as to what will actually eventuate from the standpoint of price supports for wheat if we experiment with the proposed new concept.

My amendment proposes now, as it proposed earlier, and as it was approved by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in January or February, when the bill was first brought out, to provide that in the referendum which the wheat farmers vote upon, they shall have an opportunity to elect as between the proposed new concept—a multiple price compulsory wheat program—and a continuation for 2 years of the program which is in operation today.

When a piece of proposed legislation vitally affects the income and perhaps the survival of the wheat farmers of America, it makes good sense to consult with the wheat farmers themselves to determine whether they wish to depart from the traditions of the past and experiment with something which is entirely unexplored, new and visionary so far as they are concerned.

This is the centennial year of agriculture. All of us are interested in making sure that we can develop as sound, sane, and enduring a farm program as possible. I think it is essential that those in the Wheat Belt understand what is placed

before them, which they do not now understand. Whether my amendment is agreed to or not, ultimately the farmers of America will confront a referendum by which they will have to decide between the program of their choice and virtually no program and no price supports for wheat. So instead of confronting them with the proposed multiple-price system in a referendum, without having had it fully explained, without fully understanding the alternatives, my amendment proposes that in the initial referendum the wheat farmers themselves would decide which of the two farming proposals for wheat producers they wish to vote on in the final referendum. That would be decided by majority vote. The final referendum would then operate precisely as it does now: If two-thirds of the farmers voting approved the program, it would become compulsory and mandatory.

Mr. President, agriculture, as our largest industry, employs 12 times the number of people as in the steel industry—for example, 9 times the number in the automobile industry and twice the number in the transportation and public utilities industry. The farming industry supports directly another 10 percent of our nonfarm population which supplies the farmer with his needs and processes and markets his products.

Agriculture is the principle source of all new wealth. Reliable estimates indicate that each dollar of wealth taken from the soil generates \$7 of income throughout the rest of the economy.

Agriculture is a major market for the products of other industries. For example, it uses more steel in a year than is used for a year's output of passenger cars. It uses more petroleum products than any other industry in the country. It uses more rubber each year than is required to produce tires for 6 million automobiles. Its inventory of machinery and equipment exceeds the assets of the steel industry, and is five times that of the automobile industry. Agriculture, as an industry, is made up of many small business enterprises—namely, each individual farm. These small business enterprises and small entrepreneurs manage their own businesses, market their own products, plan their operations for the future with meticulous care and with one eye on the constant threat of a natural disaster which can wipe out a year's income overnight.

American agriculture is at the crossroads today, Mr. President. It faces another important development in the coming years in the growth of the Common Market in Europe. In 1960, the Common Market share of total U.S. farm exports amounted to 22 percent of our total exports. The Department of Agriculture estimates that one out of every six acres harvested goes into export trade. The possible exclusion of the U.S. from the European market for certain commodities or even a decrease in U.S. imports into this area could force a serious reduction in U.S. production for this country.

Just last Wednesday, August 15, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, in testifying before the Senate Committee on

Finance, admitted that the Common Market negotiations in the agriculture field confronted us with new problems. He testified that the administration is hopeful of finding new ways to gain access to the Common Market and other foreign outlets.

In view of the everchanging economy of agriculture and because of the diffuse thinking among the farmers of America on the type of program which they would like, I feel that this Congress can best serve the farmers of America by giving them an opportunity to make a choice as to whether or not they desire to continue the present wheat program for the years 1963 and 1964 or whether they desire to have the mandatory control program of the administration placed in effect. It appears to me that in view of the Secretary's glowing reports of the accomplishments of the present program and also his glowing espousal of the mandatory programs, he should be more than willing to permit the farmers to make a free choice in a democratic election between these two programs. I believed the Secretary when he wrote in a letter to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] earlier this year:

I have great confidence in the judgment of the American farmers.

So does the Senator from South Dakota. I wish to give the farmers an opportunity to express their judgment in a free referendum. While Secretary Freeman was speaking of feed grains and feed grain farmers, I hope he would have the same confidence in wheat farmers.

We may disagree with their choice, but we should not deny them the right to make it.

I support that position of Secretary Freeman. If it is sound for feed grain farmers, it is sound for wheat farmers. We should not deny the wheat farmers of America the right to make the choice between two programs—on the one hand, the existing program, about which they know the full import and full impact, and on the other, a wheat certificate program which is attractive in many ways and which has strong opponents and strong proponents, but which is unnecessarily confusing and complicated.

Secondly, I raise the question, Why are we rushing pell-mell and headlong through the legislative processes with a mandatory program, with no choice for the wheat farmer but a mandatory program or economic chaos, whereas we have an alternative available to let the farmers decide which of the two programs they prefer? It seems to me that this is another effort by the Secretary and the President to give lip service to the farmer for a free choice, while on the other hand recommending from the standpoint of the wheat farmer a mandatory program of rigid controls from which they cannot escape once two-thirds of the farmers have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. President, it is late in August. Already many wheat farmers are in the fields planting next year's crop, or are about to plant it.

Let us in fairness to the wheat farmer take him from the depths of confusion

and give him a chance to vote on a program of his choice rather than using the late days of the congressional session to enact a farm bill which jams down his throat a program he does not understand or because of changing conditions he may not need or want, or which, if Common Market negotiations fail, will not meet his problem.

The committee in its wisdom did not see fit to impose a program of mandatory controls on the feed grain producers. I noted a press release last week announcing that the Senate leadership would not try to amend this section of the bill. Since the leadership believes that the feed grain section should not be made mandatory and compulsory, it seems to me that this is an additional reason why we should not select the wheat farmer for a special course of strong-arm treatment. I fully agree that we should give him the opportunity to vote on the proposals as they are outlined in H.R. 12391, as amended by the Senate committee.

I fully agree that we should also give him an opportunity to discuss and understand and express his preference with respect to the so-called multiple price system. I do not believe that we should limit his choice to that one program, or that we should try to predetermine his judgment by putting him at the end of a pistol and telling him, "Either you buy the multiple choice, wheat certificate compulsory program, with its multiple price system and its comprehensive and confusing proposals, or else you go without any wheat program at all."

In simple words, I want to give the farmer the right to say by referendum vote that he proposes to accept as his choice for a wheat program either the multiple choice program or a continuation for 2 more years of the program which he now has and which he fully understands, and which slowly but surely is beginning to cut back the wheat surpluses of America.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Yesterday in colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], and I engaged in colloquy in which we discussed the offering of an amendment to the bill which would provide that the wheat farmer, for the 1963 crop, have the present program for another year. Do I understand from the statement of the Senator that the referendum to which he has made reference on the two programs will be for the 1964 crop, to be voted on in 1963?

Mr. MUNDT. For 1963 and 1964, both if time permits. It would extend the present program to 1963 and 1964.

Mr. CARLSON. That would be voted on at the end of the crop season?

Mr. MUNDT. Before he planted the 1963 crop if possible.

Mr. CARLSON. Before the planting of the 1963 crop. Normally I would not support the Senator on this amendment. I have for many years urged the adoption of what I called the domestic parity program for wheat. I believe that a per-

manent program is needed. That program had many advantages. The certificate plan in the pending bill was in the previous bill and was patterned after that measure, but it has many complicating features. It is a very complicated piece of legislation. I was hopeful that we would not act on it at this session, but that we would give Congress another year to look at it and try to iron out some of the problems.

When this question is presented to the wheatgrowers of the Nation, if there is not a very substantial educational program they will not understand it, because it is difficult to understand.

Mr. MUNDT. That is exactly the trouble. They are likely to vote against it out of fear of the unknown, leaving them with no wheat program at all unless my amendment is adopted.

Mr. CARLSON. I shall support the amendment on that ground. I am not happy about the certificate plan as it is presented. I have always sponsored that type of program, but not as complicated as the one in the bill. It is one which I believe the farmers may not understand. I am hopeful that if the pending legislation provides for the certificate plan for wheat, we shall have an opportunity to look at it next year and try to iron out some of the difficulties which I believe complicate this bill unnecessarily. I shall support the Senator's amendment for that reason.

Mr. MUNDT. I deeply appreciate the Senator's contribution. It is generally known that the Senator from Kansas is really the father of the wheat certificate plan or multiple price proposal. So far as agricultural legislation with respect to wheat is concerned. On various occasions in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I have voted to support that program. I believe it has considerable merit. The Senator has put his finger on the problem which we now confront in legislating this late in the session on a bill that is as confusing as this one. I dare say that there are not three members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who fully understand the impact and consequences of this proposal. It is complicated and confusing. I think it is unnecessarily complicated and confusing.

I believe that if we had some time for additional hearings on the wheat section of the bill alone we could devise a certificate plan much less confusing, much less complicated, much easier to understand, and much more acceptable and useful to the wheat farmers of America.

I share the fear of the Senator from Kansas that if we present the farmers with this alternative as it is now written, H.R. 12391, as amended, so that they do not understand it, so that we cannot give them firm answers to honest questions, in despair and out of an abundance of caution and through reluctance to step into the unknown, they are likely to vote "no," and find themselves with no wheat program at all. That would be disastrous to the wheat farmers and to the American farm economy.

What does my amendment propose? It leaves the program in the bill as it is, but instead of compelling the farmer now to make up his mind about something as

complicated and as novel as this multiple price certificate plan, it gives him an opportunity to decide whether he wants that plan or a continuation of the present plan to be presented to him when he finally selects his own farm program by referendum.

If we give him an opportunity of getting the explanation, and if we can bring about an understanding, and create a meeting of minds, I am sure the result will be much better farm legislation than would result from having politicians on the Senate floor decide that they do not trust the farmers; that they know more than do the farmers, who may decide that the program is so unattractive that they may as well vote it down, and thereby decide to leave the bill as it is, presenting to the farmer, at the end of a shotgun or a pitchfork, the ugly alternative between buying a program he does not understand, a program about which there is confusion and conflicting testimony, a program representing a speculative step into the dark; or having no program at all.

My amendment gives the farmer the alternative of falling back upon a tested program, a program which has served him well in the past, although not adequately. It is not the final answer to the problem; it needs refinement. It is slowly but surely being refined. In the past year or two it has helped the farmer in the Wheat Belt, while at the same time reducing the surplus storage.

It seems to me that since the Secretary has stated that he has confidence in the small grain farmers and the feed grain farmers of America, the Senate might well state that it has confidence in all the farmers of America. We have confidence in the wheat farmers of America; and we want to submit to their judgment the decision as to which of the two farm programs they wish to have.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. When it was suggested that the referendum would apply to the 1963 crop, the Senator from Nebraska wondered whether there would be time to hold a referendum which would apply to the 1963 crop, in view of the lateness of the season.

Mr. MUNDT. Some kind of referendum will have to be held in the very early future. It has already been delayed and pushed back, because the Senate was slow in acting on legislation, and the Department of Agriculture, rightly and understandably, hoped we would act in time to enable them to incorporate the legislation. At least, the question will be acted upon the first time a referendum can be presented to the wheat farmers of America.

Mr. HRUSKA. As I understand, a referendum is scheduled for August 30.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. Does the Senator from South Dakota think that that referendum may have to be postponed?

Mr. MUNDT. That will depend on the dispatch and expedition with which the legislation is passed, sent to conference, and reported to the House. It is entirely possible that the August 30 referendum will have to be postponed, as-

suming that new legislation will be passed. It might be that this particular referendum could be held separately and at a later date.

The Senate has written some astounding agricultural history today. We have approved programs and policies of price supports which the Democratic Party has consistently opposed when they were recommended under Eisenhower and Benson. Members of the Democratic Party have today voted for this program by an almost unanimous vote. I think only two members of the Democratic Party voted against the concept of flexible price supports today. We have seen a switch from the position of the administration, which, upon seeking support from the voters, went so far as to say that the farmers are entitled to 100 percent price parity, 100 percent support, to a position of going downhill to zero. When they get the farmer there, they will present him with the alternative of a compulsory straitjacket program which would force the farmer to operate according to the dictates of the bureaucrats in Washington. That is a long retreat from parity prices. It is a complete reversal of their preelection position. That is a long retreat, even, from using net income as an adequate criterion for the farmer. It is pinning the farmers' hope to the number of bushels of corn, wheat, or other grain stored somewhere in Government warehouses. There is no rhyme or reason or economic concept to justify treating farmers with that kind of disregard.

Having done that for the corn farmers, I hope the Senate, on the same day, with the same type of partisan majority, will not now try to trap the wheat farmer and deny him his freedom of choice. I hope the Senate, when it votes on my amendment, will vote to give the wheat farmers of America the same kind of franchise, the same kind of choice, that Members of the Senate insist on having for themselves as they made up their minds how to vote on the various issues.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MUNDT. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I dislike having to oppose my genial friend from South Dakota, but the issues which are now before the Senate are the same as those which were before it in May, when S. 3225 was being considered. It will be recalled that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported the wheat provision which contained the option which the Senator from South Dakota now seeks to incorporate in the bill reported from the committee.

As I have many times stated to the Senate, the wheat program has been a costly one. I have placed in the RECORD figures which indicate what the costs have been since the inception of the program. They amount to billions of dollars. Of course, that includes gifts which have been made abroad; it includes subsidies which were paid in the wheat agreement, and also the price support

program. The cost of Public Law 480 was \$3.8 billion.

It is true that from the sale of the wheat we received, in many instances, soft currencies. We may redeem some of them. But actual price support losses amount to almost \$2 billion. The cost of the International Wheat Agreement aggregated about \$1.3 billion. All that is water under the bridge. All this resulted from the present laws affecting wheat.

In 1938, a minimum acreage of 55 million was placed in the bill. At the time that minimum acreage was placed in the bill, production was about 13.2 bushels an acre. Today the production is almost double that amount; yet the minimum acreage still remains at 55 million.

The Senator from South Dakota seeks to provide the farmer an opportunity to vote for the two-price system, which would give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to fix the production of wheat somewhat in keeping with our requirements, which are approximately 1 billion bushels a year.

The option which my good friend would give to the farmer would permit him to have an emergency program for 2 years, but at the end of that emergency period we would revert to the same old law which has given us so much trouble, and that is the law which is now on the statute books. If that proposal were submitted to the farmers, in my opinion they would vote for the 2-year emergency program, which, by the way, is very expensive; and at the end of that time we would be confronted with the present law, which has in it a provision for a minimum of 55 million acres. As I have pointed out on many occasions, the Secretary of Agriculture is unable to reduce the acreage below 55 million, and he is compelled to support prices of wheat at the rate of 75 to 90 percent of parity.

For the past 5 or 6 years, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I have tried many times to submit proposed legislation which would reduce the minimum acreage, so that production could be in keeping with our requirements. The Senate passed two bills which would have had such an effect. One of those bills was vetoed by the President. The second bill was enacted by both Houses, and went to conference. The Senate adopted the conference report, but the House refused to do so. So we were put back to the old law—the 1938 act—which has caused so much expense, as I pointed out a moment ago.

The amendment proposed by my good friend, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], would provide—as I stated a few minutes ago—an opportunity to vote in the referendum for either of the two options. In May of this year, the Senate voted to strike that provision from the bill. I am very hopeful that a similar vote will be cast at this time.

I could say much more on this subject; but I believe Senators are familiar with the proposal. It is very simple. However, if we were to adopt the amendment, I fear that within 2 years we would have expended in excess of \$700 million,

and then we would have to revert to the 1938 act—which, I repeat, has caused us great expense.

I fear that if existing programs were to be continued for wheat, milk, corn, and other feed grains, it would jeopardize the rest of the farm program; and I am sure no Senator would wish to see that occur.

I am willing at any time to yield time to any Senator who desires to speak on the amendment, or to yield back the remainder of the time under my control, if the Senator from South Dakota is willing to do likewise.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield briefly to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assured the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] that I would do the best I could to have the yeas and nays ordered on the question of agreeing to his amendment to the committee amendment. So, Mr. President, in order to expedite the procedure, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the question of agreeing to the Mundt amendment to the committee amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota. If I may proceed for about 3 minutes, in order to conclude my remarks, I shall be ready for the vote.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am sure that the previous yeas-and-nays vote, by which the Senate voted to end price supports for the producers of corn, will be discussed for many years by agricultural experts and by writers on the farm economy. Inasmuch as that vote involves a change of position by many prominent Senators, all of whom are dear friends of mine, I shall not embarrass any of them by quoting statements which have been made in previous debates on these issues. However, for the aid of researchers, students, and editorial writers, I point out that if they will refer to volume 102 of the bound CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, part 3, 84th Congress, 2d session, including the debates from February 20, 1956, to March 7, 1956, and will read the debates which occurred at that time, and will study the rollcall votes which were taken, beginning on page 3128 and continuing to page 4150, they will conclude that the one who wrote the axiom "There is nothing new under the sun," was a second cousin of Ananias, because when we come to deal with agriculture, there are many new things under the sun. These include the way Senators vote—and their reasons for such votes.

Mr. President, I shall be brief. I merely wish to point out that I believe it exceedingly unfortunate that on the last yeas-and-nays vote the Senate decided to deny the farmers of America a free choice between the two programs. I am glad, however, to hear statements in favor of economy by Senators on the

other side of the aisle. However, economy should be an across-the-board performance; it should be a consistent operation. I dislike to think that the only place where this session of Congress will do any economizing will be on the scalp of the American farmer, by cutting his price supports for corn down to zero, and by putting him into a new wheat program which is so complicated that no one knows with certainty whether it will help or will hurt the farmer. But all of us know it will cut back wheat production sharply, will result in the retirement from production of additional acres of land, and will eliminate the 55-million-acre base which has been so important to the wheat farmers.

However, as I have said, some strange things are happening these days in agricultural legislation. It seems to me we get our economics and our politics badly confused.

I have made my case for this amendment. I believe in freedom of choice for the wheat farmers; and that is all my amendment proposes.

If the distinguished chairman of the committee decides that we have debated this issue long enough, inasmuch as the yeas and nays have already been ordered, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Then, Mr. President, obviously I have concluded.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I would like to ask a question in regard to section 379(b) (1) which can be found on page 83 of the bill and reads, as follows:

All persons engaged in the processing of wheat into food products composed wholly or partly of wheat shall, prior to marketing any such product for human food in the United States, acquire marketing certificates equivalent to the number of bushels of wheat contained in such product.

Most wheat used in this country is processed into flour, but not all flour is used as human food in this country. A substantial portion of the flour is used in industrial processing. The end product of the industrial process may or may not consist of food products. In one particular process a portion of the resultant product is used for food purposes and the remainder is not. In addition, a certain amount of the flour is lost in processing.

I would like to know if marketing certificates will be required for all of the wheat milled into flour used in such industrial processes in spite of the fact that all or part of such wheat is finally used for nonfood purposes, or lost in processing.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this particular question was brought to my attention by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] some time ago, and I have requested a clarification from the Department of Agriculture. I have been assured by the Department that in such cases a price adjustment will be arranged either with the millers or the industrial processors of flour in recognition of the fact that not all of

the end product is to be used for human food purposes.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control; and I am ready for the vote to be taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to the committee amendment. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay," and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senators from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS and Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator

from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON and Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 50, as follows:

[No. 210 Leg.]

YEAS—29

Alken	Eastland	Pearson
Beall	Fong	Prouty
Bennett	Goldwater	Russell
Bottom	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bush	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Javits	Thurmond
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Tower
Case	Keating	Wiley
Curtis	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Dirksen	Mundt	

NAYS—50

Bartlett	Holland	Metcalf
Burdick	Humphrey	Monroney
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Morse
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston	Moss
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Muskie
Cooper	Kefauver	Neuberger
Dodd	Kerr	Pell
Douglas	Lausche	Proxmire
Ellender	Long, Mo.	Randolph
Engle	Long, Hawaii	Smith, Mass.
Ervin	Long, La.	Sparkman
Fulbright	Magnuson	Stennis
Gore	Mansfield	Talmadge
Hart	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Hartke	McClellan	Yarborough
Hayden	McGee	Young, Ohio
Hill	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—21

Allott	Church	Murphy
Anderson	Clark	Pastore
Bible	Cotton	Robertson
Boggs	Gruening	Scott
Butler	Hickey	Smathers
Carroll	Kuchel	Symington
Chavez	Morton	Williams, Del.

So Mr. MUNDT's amendment, to the committee amendment, was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "8-20-62—G," on behalf of myself and Senators JAVITS, SCOTT, CASE, and SALTONSTALL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 46, line 11, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 104. No agreement or payment shall be made under this title unless the Secretary determines that any public facilities which may be developed with Federal assistance will be available to all persons without discrimination on account of race.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe I should notify the Senator from New York that it is my intention to move to table his amendment. I wish to notify him ahead of time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I appreciate his usual courtesy. I understand that will be his motion. It is my understanding that, following my presentation, some of the cosponsors of the amendment and other Senators may wish to speak. I hope the Senator from Montana will withhold his motion.

Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. Would it be proper and appropriate for me at this time to ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to table, or must I wait until the motion is made?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator can ask unanimous consent.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may now make a request for the yeas and nays on the motion to table.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to withhold it.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator will permit, I should like to query the distinguished majority leader concerning the program for the remainder of today and also for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, it was our hope that the Senate could remain in session long enough tonight to have the third reading of the bill. It is our understanding that it is desired to have the third reading of the bill tonight, which might require remaining in session a little longer. When the amend-

ment offered by the Senator from New York is disposed of, one way or another, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] intends to offer an amendment, on which he would like to have the yeas and nays.

Because of the fact that certain Senators are absent from the Chamber due to unavoidable circumstances, it was hoped that we could obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to have a vote on the question of passage of the bill at the conclusion of morning business tomorrow.

It is anticipated that following consideration of this bill, the Senate will consider S. 1552, a bill to amend and supplement the antitrust laws with respect to the manufacture and distribution of drugs, and for other purposes.

Following consideration of the drug bill, the Senate will consider H.R. 10743, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes.

Following consideration of that bill, the Senate will consider H.R. 11721, a bill to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission and to authorize the appropriation of \$73 million for that purpose.

Following consideration of that bill, the Senate will consider H.R. 10650, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for investment in certain depreciable property, to eliminate certain defects and inequities, and for other purposes.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations tonight it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KEATING obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me for a couple of minutes?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

COCKTAIL LOUNGE IN THE CAPITOL?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I just read an interesting note from the ticker, which says:

COCKTAIL LOUNGE?

WASHINGTON.—If there's a cocktail lounge in the Capitol, it's being hidden from J. George Stewart, the big building's architect and custodian.

Stewart has been deluged recently with inquiries about the existence of a formal drinking room in the Capitol, especially in the new multimillion-dollar east front extension.

Somehow or other, he told a reporter, a rumor got around that a fancy cocktail lounge was hidden away in the new front.

Members of Congress have been relaying to Stewart the indignant letters from constituents asking for an explanation.

"You have my personal assurance," Stewart said, "that there is no cocktail lounge in the extended east front of the Capitol or in any other part of the building. No consideration was ever given to the installation of a cocktail lounge."

Of course, Mr. President, Mr. Stewart's omissions speak louder than his words. He owes to the people who write to him, or who write to Members of Congress and whose letters are relayed or "bucked over" to him for an answer to letters of indignation, an answer to the effect that in the conference room of the Senate from time to time cocktails are served, and they are served in connection with official Senate affairs.

The Senator from Oregon has made his position very clear in that regard. His resolution seeking to prevent the desecration of that room, and thereby the Capitol, because of the serving of cocktails at various affairs in that room, is still languishing in the Committee on Rules and Administration. The Senator wrote to members of the Committee on Rules and Administration about this resolution several weeks ago, but never received the courtesy of a reply from a single member of the committee.

I want Senators to bear in mind that Congress has not yet adjourned. That resolution will be used by the Senator from Oregon at an appropriate time as a rider on proposed legislation, before Congress adjourns. I will do my best to compel Senators to stand up and be counted on the resolution.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12391) to improve and protect farm income, to reduce costs of farm programs to the Federal Government, to reduce the Federal Government's excessive stocks of agricultural commodities, to maintain reasonable and stable prices of agricultural commodities and products to consumers, to provide adequate supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic and foreign needs, to conserve natural resources, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, my amendment provides that no agreement or payment shall be made under the title I provisions of this bill unless the Secretary of Agriculture has determined that any public facilities which may be developed with Federal assistance or funds be open to all persons without discrimination on account of race.

There really should be no need for such an amendment. In my judgment, Federal funds cannot be lawfully appropriated for any programs which discriminate against Americans because of their race. A Federal subsidy for segregated facilities of any kind is not only unfair and unjust, but in my judgment, illegal.

The rather inconsistent and confused position of the Secretary of Agriculture on this important matter is very disappointing. Earlier in the session when

the Senate first considered farm legislation, the Department assured me orally that no money would be allocated for projects which would not be open to citizens of all races.

This assurance was given to me by the General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, who has been in the news of late. It was made to me in the midst of the debate on the farm bill in May when I first proposed this amendment. The General Counsel stated that no Federal funds would be allotted under title I for segregated recreation facilities. A letter confirming these assurances was promised.

Some of my colleagues may remember that after the defeat of the amendment by a narrow margin of three votes, in fairness to the Secretary of Agriculture, I announced on the floor of the Senate that I had received that assurance and that I would be getting a letter backing it up.

There were reports, thereafter, contradicting these assurances. I have attempted to contact both the General Counsel and the Secretary repeatedly with the hope of having their viewpoint clarified. I regret to announce that I have not yet received the promised written statement or any other confirmation of the Department's position. At the same time, there have been other reports that the Department now refuses to give any promise that funds will not be granted for segregated recreational facilities under this legislation. This vacillating attitude of the Department on such a vital issue is very disturbing. It is reminiscent of the difficulty we encountered in getting a clear statement on the Labor-HEW appropriation bill from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as to whether that Department's funds would be used to finance segregated hospitals and schools. A clear and unequivocal statement of the administration's position on these issues is long overdue. On the record to date we have no choice but to write into this bill an explicit provision requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to make certain that no Federal tax funds are going to be spent for racially segregated parks, picnic areas, and other recreational facilities—and I find the program under title I to be one of the better parts of the bill.

Adoption of this amendment will prevent an otherwise desirable program for converting marginal and unneeded farm lands into recreational areas from being tainted by racial prejudice. It is far better that we make our position crystal clear at the inception of the program instead of waiting until there are incidents, infringements of rights and prolonged litigation. If we allow recreation facilities to be set aside from surplus lands on a segregated basis, we may be certain that it will only be a matter of time before our courts are faced with dozens of cases demanding equal rights under the Constitution. It is much more constructive and desirable to take our stand now and to avoid later complications and embarrassments.

Very few Members of this body have objection to title I of this bill. The idea of converting surplus land and land that

has proved to be uneconomic into recreational areas is a good one. Not only will it in a small way help to curb excess agricultural production, but it will also provide areas for recreation for many persons who now have no such parks and water areas. Many of us strongly endorse any program that will work to alleviate farm surplus and any idea that will at the same time provide benefits to such a large portion of our population. My amendment is designed to invigorate title I by making certain that its benefits will flow to all our citizens. The tax money from which this appropriation comes was collected without any racial classifications, and it should be disbursed on the same basis.

It makes no difference if this Federal assistance is on the basis of loans or grants or whether the area is to be managed by Federal, State, or local authorities. If the Federal Government is to be a partner in these ventures, then the facilities should be open to all Americans without regard to race. We should guarantee that all new parks and recreation areas will be places where any American can go with his family without fear of being turned away. Far too many times of late the Congress has passed legislation which can aggravate our country's race problem. Here is a good chance to reverse the trend.

I wish to refer briefly to what took place last Thursday when an amendment was offered to the space communications bill that would prohibit discrimination in employment by any corporation participating in the program.

A strong appeal was made at that time by the proponents of that amendment, including the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who took a leading part in the debate.

A strong argument was made at that time by the proponents of the amendment to Senators on both sides of the aisle to live up to the platforms of both parties pledging action along those lines. We were forcefully reminded of the solemn promises that were made at the conventions and repeated throughout the campaign. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] urged the Senate "not to resort to parliamentary tactics in order to prevent the Senate, for the first time this session, to have a vote on the merits of a civil rights amendment."

I might say, parenthetically, that that was not the first time, but the second, because the first time was when this amendment was offered to the last farm bill which was before the Senate. It was the second time. Both the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] argued eloquently for the redemption of our clear, unequivocal, unqualified, unmistakable assurances to the American people that both our political parties would work for abolition of discrimination on the ground of race, creed, color, or national origin.

At that time, although I differed with Senators DOUGLAS, MORSE, and CLARK on the merits of the satellite communica-

tions bill, and strongly supported that bill on its merits, because of my deep conviction that the principle which the Senators from Pennsylvania and Illinois and others were espousing was right, I gave this nondiscrimination amendment to the space bill my wholehearted support.

I do not believe progress will ever be made in the field of civil rights by making tactical withdrawals and retreats. Whenever civil rights measures are offered in the Senate, tactical reasons are given for not pressing them. We are told to wait for another day, which somehow never arrives. We are always urged to postpone the question to a more convenient time, but that convenient time is never now.

We have retreated long enough. We have compromised long enough. We should have learned by now that the only way we can progress in this field is by pressing forward at every opportunity with the conviction and determination that a just cause should not be postponed to another day.

The American people will not be fooled by tactical explanations of votes against civil rights. They will not be misled by a pretext for saying no to principles which we should be warmly embracing and which both parties have promised to the American people.

If the day comes when any Negro father or mother has to tell a small child that a picnic in a Government-financed park area is off limits to Americans of their color, all these pretexts and excuses will quickly evaporate.

This is another challenge to our convictions. Let us not shun this test. It is time for those of us on both sides of the aisle who believe in civil rights to work as forcibly to achieve our objectives as those who oppose civil rights work to defeat them.

Today will be the payoff as to whether we believe in the platform and principles we have advocated before the country, or whether they are simply for campaign purposes.

Those are not my words; those are the words of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] last week. The distinguished Senator from Illinois has been a strong and persistent warrior for civil rights, and I have considered it a privilege to join with him and others in both parties for goals which we mutually sought.

Today I make the same plea. When this identical amendment was before the Senate in May, a motion to table carried by a margin of only three votes. A change in only two votes would have led to specific recognition in one of the laws of this Congress that the Federal Government has no right to use tax funds for racially segregated projects. I hope that today will be the occasion for declaring that simple but vital principle.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I join the Senator from New York in his amendment because, if we are to create areas for youths, I consider it a perfectly logical basis on which to act to make it clear

that we intend that all people may enjoy them, no matter who they may be.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I appreciate his cosponsorship of the amendment. I know of his sincere and honest dedication to the cause of civil rights. It is an honor to be associated with him in this effort.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment, of which I have the honor to be a cosponsor. I believe that the necessity for the amendment arises from what may properly be called de facto segregation. Perhaps the situation which we find in places like Albany, Ga., is the best example of that.

When we look into these situations and take the cover off them, we find that what is supposedly provided by our national statutes as representing lawful management does not necessarily obtain in practice.

Senators will recall that I have tried on previous occasions to reach the archaic rule in the Hill-Burton Act, under which Federal funds are granted to hospitals which are in essence segregated establishments because of the archaic definition in the law respecting separate but equal facilities, although the Federal Government and everyone else knows that that definition would not stand up for 5 minutes in a court of law, that the Supreme Court has decided precisely to the contrary, and that the concept of separate but equal facilities is unconstitutional.

Nonetheless, the Government continues to issue regulations in hospital situations premised upon the separate but equal idea.

There is such a thing as local custom, which is pertinent to this amendment. The quality and nature of social organization, as one of our Members is wont to call it, is such that the community tolerates segregation, which is contrary to the Constitution, but is not expressly contrary to any law. A lawsuit may be started, which is a very expensive and tough undertaking.

Therefore, the amendment which the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] is sponsoring and in which many of us join, should be adopted. It will be remembered that I had a similar fight with respect to segregation at airport terminals, in which a couple of years were required before the practice caught up with the law, again, because the law did not specifically spell out in so many words what is sought to be spelled out here.

The new approach involves the idea of recreation areas which are developed from reserve lands, as conducive to the development of a more mature and more advisable farm program. In my view, it is important that when a new program is started, the de facto segregation and customs of local communities should be laid aside and we should return to the fundamental proposals involved.

In connection with the bill, about which there has been some discussion in the Government Operations Committee, of which I am a member, specific instances and examples have been cited in which for years, in national parks and

national forests in Southern States segregation has been practiced de facto, indicating that unless there is a specific regulation on the subject we get into difficulties. Examples go back to 1959 and 1960. They are very specific with respect to what took place at places like Chat-tahoochee National Forest in Georgia, the De Soto National Park in Mississippi, and a naval housing reservation in Norfolk, Va. These are specific examples of de facto segregation being practiced.

It is clear to me that there is good reason for an amendment of this character, spelling out in precise terms what we have in mind in creating a national benefit through a new park. We should see to it that the situation of which we may later properly complain may be avoided, because we state what we mean, what we intend, and what we desire, without any nonsense or doubt about it, and without letting local customs prevail for years and years, and without the requirement that there be lawsuits or battles on the floor of the Senate to bring about our manifest intention in the law.

So anticipating the argument which is at the root of the motion to table—and I say this with all respect to the majority leader; I understand his problem—namely, that the Federal Government, through the Federal departments, will administer lands of this character in a nondiscriminatory way, it has been our experience that in every case, unless provision is made in unmistakable terms, and there is a law to tie to, there will be no compliance. We have sought to amend appropriation bills, but have been unable to do so because our proposals are considered to be substantive law. Now we have an opportunity to legislate in accordance with what I deem to be the views of the overwhelming majority of this body.

If the motion to table prevails, it will carry, in my view, not in accord with the best judgment on this issue, whatever may be the overriding considerations as to the farm bill. In my judgment, a motion to table, if carried, would not be in accordance with the views expressed time and time again by a majority of the Members of this body.

I hope we will be true to ourselves on this subject and take the opportunity offered to us by this amendment to vote to reject the motion to table, and support the amendment.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON ARTS BILLS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to give notice to the Members of the Senate and other interested parties that the Special Subcommittee on the Arts of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman, will hold hearings on three pending bills affecting the arts, beginning August 29, 1962, and continuing on August 30 and, if needed, on September 7, 1962.

The three bills under consideration will be:

S. 741, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr.

COOPER, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. LONG of Missouri, to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts;

S. 785, introduced by Mr. CLARK, for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. PELL, to establish a program of grants to States for the development of programs and projects in the arts; and

S. 1250, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, to establish the U.S. Arts Foundation.

The hearings will be held in the committee's hearing room, 4232, New Senate Office Building, and will begin at 10 a.m. on each day.

Serving with me on the subcommittee are Senators YARBOROUGH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, CLARK, JAVITS, and PROUTY.

A special effort will be made to obtain testimony on community cultural activities and needs in cities and States in various parts of the country.

Those who wish to appear before the subcommittee to present testimony on these bills, or to submit statements for the record, should make arrangements with Mr. Stewart E. McClure, chief clerk of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, extension 5375.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, when I requested the appointment of a subcommittee and hearings in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on bills relating to a national cultural establishment for the Nation, I did so in full recognition of the fact that Federal participation in a program to help the development of our Nation's resources in the performing and visual arts is vital to our morale at home and to our leadership in the cold war struggle.

I express my appreciation to Senator LISTER HILL, my distinguished chairman, for granting this request, and congratulate Senator PELL on being named as chairman.

The image that we project abroad among the peoples of the developing nations becomes an important factor in helping them resist Communist infiltration and aggression; and our cultural posture makes up a very essential part of our total position and prestige in Western civilization. We can ignore only at our own peril the need for a cultural base in depth within our borders.

Some of the greatest long-range benefits to the United States abroad have come from our cultural exchange agreements in which American artists of note have rendered magnificent service as exponents of our country's culture and in promoting good relations with other nations.

In the forthcoming hearings which have just been announced we shall have an opportunity to get at all sides of this problem and also to make it clear that the principal source of assistance to the performing and visual arts will continue to be private and philanthropic sources as it has been always. It is important to emphasize that the Federal Government's position will not in any way endanger the traditional freedom of the artist and his form of expression and that the legislation before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee does not in any way infringe upon this time-honored prerogative of the artist.

Federal participation and encouragement of the arts is not a new thing, and

has been expressed in many ways for over 100 years. My own activity in the Congress goes back to 1949 when as a Member of the House, I introduced a resolution calling for the establishment of an American National Theater establishment. The legislation which I have sponsored in this Congress calls for establishment of a U.S. Arts Foundation to help bring about wider dissemination of the arts and within the framework of free enterprise and voluntary association to help in the development of new talent and expose more people and more places to the best in American culture than any other proposal now before the Congress.

Federal assistance for expansion of the arts is an urgent necessity, and I am confident that the forthcoming hearings will result in a bill which the Senate can adopt.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I commend and congratulate the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, who once again has shown the initiative which has made him so valued a Member of this body. I know that, as always, he will render outstanding service.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO FILE REPORT FOLLOWING ADJOURNMENT OF SENATE TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to file, during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session a report and certain additional amendments to the bill (S. 1552) to amend and supplement the antitrust laws with respect to the manufacture and distribution of drugs, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12391) to improve and protect farm income, to reduce costs of farm programs to the Federal Government, to reduce the Federal Government's excessive stocks of agricultural commodities, to maintain reasonable and stable prices of agricultural commodities and products to consumers, to provide adequate supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic and foreign needs, to conserve natural resources, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] be laid on the table.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on that motion, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." Were I at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senators from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS and Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON and Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 37, as follows:

[No. 211 Leg.] YEAS—40

Bartlett	Jackson	Moss
Burdick	Johnston	Muskie
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Neuberger
Byrd, W. Va.	Kerr	Robertson
Cannon	Long, Hawaii	Russell
Eastland	Long, La.	Sparkman
Ellender	Magnuson	Stennis
Engle	Mansfield	Talmadge
Ervin	McCarthy	Thurmond
Fulbright	McClellan	Tower
Gore	McNamara	Yarborough
Hayden	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Hill	Monroney	
Holland	Morse	

NAYS—37

Aiken	Fong	Pearson
Beall	Goldwater	Pell
Bennett	Hart	Proxmire
Bottum	Hartke	Randolph
Bush	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Capehart	Hruska	Smith, Mass.
Carlson	Javits	Smith, Maine
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Wiley
Cooper	Keating	Williams, N.J.
Curtis	Lausche	Young, Ohio
Dirksen	Long, Mo.	
Dodd	Miller	
Douglas	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—23

Allott	Clark	Morton
Anderson	Cotton	Murphy
Bible	Gruening	Pastore
Boggs	Hickey	Scott
Butler	Humphrey	Smathers
Carroll	Kefauver	Symington
Chavez	Kuchel	Williams, Del.
Church	McGee	

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the motion to lay on the table was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I do not intend to call up the amendment in the nature of a substitute for the farm bill, which I have had printed and laid on the table; instead, I offer it as an amendment to the committee amendment. I send the amendment to the desk, and ask that it be stated. It is offered on behalf of myself and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment it is proposed to add a new title, as follows:

PLAN TO TERMINATE ALL ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS, MARKETING QUOTAS, AND PRICE SUPPORTS

In order that the farmers of this country may carry on their farming operations in the tradition of the free enterprise system unhampered by needless Federal controls, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to formulate and submit to the Congress, within one hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment of this Act, proposals for legislation the aim and effect of which will be to (1) increase the acreage allotments and marketing quotas annually on all agricultural commodities subject to such controls until such controls have been removed entirely, and (2) reduce

the levels of price support annually on all agricultural commodities for which such support is provided until such support has been removed entirely. The period of time within which all acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and price support shall be terminated under any proposals for legislation submitted by the Secretary to the Congress shall not be more than six years nor less than four years from the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If I may have the attention of the Senate, I wish to say that I have discussed this matter with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], the minority leader, and other members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on both sides, and I wish at this time to propound a unanimous-consent request; namely, that on the pending amendment 1½ hours be allowed, 45 minutes to a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I listened attentively to the reading of the amendment. As the Senator knows, I asked for order so we might hear the amendment read. The amendment is different from the one now at the desk. Is that correct?

Mr. TOWER. It differs only in that it is an amendment to the committee amendment to the bill, and not a substitute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the amendment include ultimate elimination of marketing orders on fruits and vegetables and milk, as well?

Mr. TOWER. It does, but it only directs the Secretary of Agriculture to propound a plan for the phasing out of agricultural controls, subsidies, and so forth. It is not in itself farm legislation; it is simply a directive to the Secretary of Agriculture to propose a plan, which, of course, would be submitted to the Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But that plan would also include elimination of marketing orders, as I have mentioned, on fruits and vegetables and milk products?

Mr. TOWER. It would include those, yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator from Texas plan to use all of his 45 minutes?

Mr. TOWER. I do not intend to use all of the 45 minutes myself. I will probably use 20 minutes for my own presentation. I do not know how many of my colleagues may desire to speak on the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry how much time he expects to take.

Mr. ELLENDER. About 3 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator from Massachusetts understood correctly what the Senator from Texas said to the Senator from Minnesota, this is merely a proposal to ask the Secretary of Agriculture to submit a plan to Congress for the future. It does not say he shall do certain things, but leaves it up to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. TOWER. In response to the Senator from Massachusetts, the amendment simply directs the Secretary of Agriculture to propose a plan for phasing out all controls and subsidies. It would not narrowly proscribe him or limit him in any way. It would compel him to report within 120 days from the time of the enactment of the bill. It also provides that the plan shall prescribe phasing out in not less than 4 years or more than 6 years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The amendment is merely to have the Secretary submit a plan within 120 days?

Mr. TOWER. Yes, to submit a plan within 120 days to the Congress for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has now consumed three minutes. How much additional time does he yield himself?

Mr. TOWER. I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. President, the frustrating thing about the whole history of farm legislation is that the farm problem seems no nearer to solution today than 10 or 20 years ago.

At the risk of oversimplification, let me summarize my basic point of view as follows: There is not anything wrong with agriculture that a little less government would not cure. Too many times Government has done something to "help" farmers that created artificial incentives for farmers to increase production. Too many times Government has supported prices at levels that drastically limited the volume that could be marketed at the fixed price. Too frequently short run expedients have been adopted without adequate attention to the longrun consequences.

The greatest threat to freedom and opportunity in agriculture comes from those who assert that the way to help farmers is to fix prices at high levels and then institute strict production and marketing controls to prevent the creation of surpluses. It is my conviction that this is the wrong road for farmers. This is the road to controlled poverty in American agriculture—or nationalization of the production of food and fiber.

Price support programs are a trap for farmers. In the early years of a price support program, its effect on farmers appears to be wholly beneficiary. But the price support program has a cumulative impact on the marketing outlook. Production increases, consumption declines, surpluses accumulate.

When this point is reached, farmers are "hooked." If they do not accept controls, the existing surpluses and the artificially stimulated excessive production capacity will have drastic effect upon the price and market outlook for

their products. If the farmer is reluctant to accept controls, they are likely to be forced upon him by one means or another to reduce Government costs.

The farm problem can be described as a vise, with declining farm prices constituting one jaw and rising production costs the other.

This comparison, however, fails to recognize all the elements involved. Net farm income may be defined as volume times price minus costs. All three elements are equally important. A high price that results in loss of export markets or a reduction in domestic markets may reduce net farm incomes just as effectively as a low price.

In recent years risings of costs has been a primary factor in reducing net farm incomes. The following table summarizes the drastic change which has occurred in the relationship of farm costs to income.

I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD at this point. It reveals that net farm income is down \$3.1 billion.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Billions of dollars]

	Gross farm income	Production costs	Net farm income
1947-49 average.....	33.7	17.9	15.8
1961.....	39.6	26.9	12.7
Change, up (+), down (-).....	+5.9	+9.0	-3.1

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, part of the answer to the farm income problem is to avoid national policies that result in increased costs.

Costs do not just happen. Increased costs stem from a whole series of Government policies and actions which convert into prices and costs.

Inflation adds to costs. Government spending is converted into costs and prices. Taxes add to costs, not only directly, but, more important, in their effect on prices. For example, most corporation income taxes are not paid by corporations. They are paid by people who buy things sold by corporations. Most Government expenditures are, in the final analysis, paid by consumers of goods and services. This hits farmers doubly because not only do they buy the same consumer items as other people, but in addition, they buy goods and services for production.

The purpose and intent of the farm bills enacted over the years by the Congress was, of course, to raise farm incomes. Unfortunately, this effort too frequently overlooked basic economic factors. The farm problem has been compounded by efforts to solve an essentially economic problem by political panaceas. The farm problem has gotten involved in the political arena, has become a political issue. Votes are sought, political capital is all too frequently made, of the farm program. So immersed in politics and politicians is the farm problem—and vice versa—that rational solutions are too often virtually ignored.

We have created a patchwork of laws, often temporary expedients adopted to meet crises of varying degrees and kinds. Our farm laws, because they too frequently conflict with economic principles, have become the progenitors and perpetuators of our current farm problem. The farm programs have become a part of the problem.

American agriculture has passed and is passing through a period of vast and rapid change. No longer are our farms characterized by man-and-mule operation. As recently as 1940, 1 farmworker supplied 11 people with food and fiber. In 1961, 1 farmworker supplied the needs of 26 people. Productivity per man-hour in the past 10 years has increased 80 percent in agriculture, compared with 25 percent in industry. About twice as much capital is invested per worker in agriculture as in industry.

Technological change in agriculture has not reached any end point. There are some signs that the agricultural revolution is even accelerating. Technological change is remaking American agriculture at a pace unprecedented in human history.

Farm programs are necessarily based upon prices, practices, production, yields, and marketing of the past. But the past never fits the future. Farm programs try vainly to prevent change. To the extent they are able to delay change, they create new problems. Controls have bred many of the problems with which farmers are now confronted.

One of the inescapable results of the farm programs as they have operated is that they have held an umbrella over the world price, have encouraged expansion of competitive production in other countries. Actually, this problem would have been more crucial than it has been, except for the political turmoil and uneconomic practices of governments in other countries which has interfered with their normal growth and productive development.

A second inescapable result of price fixing is the development of substitutes. Ask any informed cotton man what price support programs for cotton at too high levels have done to substitute synthetics for cotton in Europe and in the United States. Markets once lost are hard, often impossible, to regain.

Controls cannot be imposed on one crop without affecting others. Land idled by a control program for one crop is likely to be used to produce other crops. Much of the land taken out of cotton and wheat production, for example, has been shifted to feed grains with the result that there is currently a surplus of feed grains.

The economist speaks of the inelasticity of demand for farm products. By this he means that consumption does not change very much when price is lowered. Therefore, a small excess of production results in a major change in price. This is most clearly illustrated by the case of tobacco. Consumption of tobacco appears to be virtually independent of change in price. Therefore, a small surplus of tobacco, in the absence of price supports, would result in

a drastic reduction in the price of tobacco.

But the same is not true of many other products. Most of all, it is not true of that huge livestock-feed-forage complex that represents about 60 percent of U.S. agriculture. Demand for these products—which go to market as eggs, milk, and meat—is comparatively flexible. Another way to say this is that consumers will eat more meat at a low price than they will at a high price.

Without going into a lot of economics, this means simply that production controls in the tobacco industry may operate to increase farmers' incomes, but that production controls in the feed-livestock industry will not. I do not know of any definitive research on this point, but even assuming production controls on feed and livestock are feasible—and I do not assume this—I believe that farm incomes from the production of feed-livestock will be substantially reduced, not increased, by production controls.

It should also be noted in this connection that even where the size of domestic demand does not change much with a change in price, export demand for the same commodities is often extremely responsive to changes in price.

Acreage controls and price supports cannot provide an adequate income for a farm family with an acreage allotment too small for efficient and modern farming practices. A farm family with inadequate land resources cannot hope to increase its income from agriculture materially unless it is able to enlarge its operations so as to permit the adoption of modern technology. The rigidities of farm support and control programs are an obstacle to such progress.

The efficient farmer, small, or large, is penalized by controls. Costs for many farm operations are about the same, even if acreage is reduced. Controls therefore increase unit costs. Efficient farmers, who could profitably produce for export and domestic markets at a particular price, are foreclosed from producing for such markets if the price is raised to a level resulting in the loss or reduction of such markets.

During the emergency of the depression of the thirties, many measures were taken to alleviate desperately critical situations, including price support and production controls for a number of farm commodities. I am not inclined to be critical of everything that was done in New Deal days although I have criticized most things that were done in the New Deal days. Desperate situations sometimes warrant desperate remedies. But it does not follow that what may have been desirable or at least warranted during the dark days of the depression is necessarily the desirable approach to the problem under different circumstances. In fact, I am sure it is not. Amazing as it may appear, some of the congressional debate of the farm problem still harks back to the depression years. The argument is still made that if it was good then, it is good now. It is even suggested that all that keeps agriculture out of the conditions that existed in 1930-33 are the Government farm programs.

This is ridiculous when it is recalled that only some 22 percent of U.S. farm production has been subject to production control programs. Actually, the most prosperous part of American agriculture has been that part not involved with controls and price supports.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has popularized the term "supply management." This is just a new term to describe an old objective. A synonym would be centralized control of agriculture, or political management of agriculture.

Under this supply management concept the Federal Government would, by controlling the production and marketing of all farm commodities, fix the amount of each product that each farmer could produce and sell.

Under this proposal, the Secretary of Agriculture would replace the market as the primary guiding force in American agriculture.

To continue down the road of controls and high, artificial price supports is to court disaster. We now have over \$7 billion invested by the Department of Agriculture Commodity Credit Corporation in price support loans and inventories. Each day about \$1,400,000 of taxpayers' money is paid out for storing the commodities held by the Government. And this is despite a massive Federal program to dispose of surplus commodities that cost billions more.

The choice confronting us is clear. One is based on Government intervention and control, the other on a farmer's freedom to farm; one on a Government market, the other on a free market; one on dependence on Federal appropriations for farm income, the other on consumer demand.

Perhaps the best expression of farmer sentiment on this question was indicated by a poll of its farmer readers by the Farm Journal. In the June 1962 issue was published a summary of replies to a questionnaire to their readers—64,560 farmers sent in their views. The questions and results follow:

First. Compulsory Government quotas—on what I could sell, or how much land I could farm; stiff penalties, support prices at, or above, present levels—only 4 percent for.

Second. Expanded voluntary land-retirement program to cut crop production; no compulsory quotas or allotments; with supports on crops at a level to stabilize markets but not add to surpluses—43 percent for.

Third. Get the Government clear out—no controls, no price supports—53 percent for.

Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president of the Nation's largest farm organization, the Farm Bureau Federation, said recently:

I am convinced that Government intervention in the agricultural price and production decisions has materially reduced farm income. Government payments and subsidies have been only a partial offset to the tremendous losses in price and income suffered by the producers of wheat, feed grains, cotton and other crops as a result of the Government price depressing surplus disposal operations and the displacement of farm crops by substitute products * * *. We

would have been much wiser if we had devoted a small proportion of the manpower, time and money spent during the last 15 years on futile attempts to control production and rig markets, to a sustained effort to improve the operation of the competitive market.

The Farm Bureau Federation for many years has been the major opponent of centralized management of agriculture. That Farm Bureau's views represent the views of most farmers is evidenced by the fact that, although membership in Farm Bureau is entirely voluntary, each year for many years a larger percentage of the Nation's farmers are enrolled as Farm Bureau members.

Many of those who have been most prominent in promoting high levels of price support for farmers are now demanding that restrictive production controls be imposed.

Having gotten farmers in trouble by unwise price policies that have resulted in surplus production and heavy costs, the high price support advocates refuse to admit that this is the cause of the trouble. They blame the farmer for his opposition to production controls. The 1962 farm program of the administration was a punitive measure to punish farmers for the surpluses created by mistakes in Government policies.

Very few would seriously propose that after decades of Government intervention in agriculture, we should suddenly withdraw all Government assistance to farmers. But I am convinced that the goal toward which we should strive should be to move as rapidly as feasible in the direction of reducing the scope of Government participation in the pricing, production, and marketing of farm products.

Mr. President, my amendment would not of itself make alterations in the existing farm program. It would merely require the Secretary of Agriculture, who, with his vast Department and thousands of experts and technicians, should have on tap the best possible information regarding agriculture, to submit to the Congress a plan for ending Federal subsidies and controls. The Congress, acting upon the Secretary's proposed plan, would still be the implementing and final authority.

Committee meetings would be held, at which there would be manifestations of public reaction, and reactions from the farm community in particular.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would 4 to 6 years be a sufficient time to make the necessary adjustments that would finally bring agriculture into a completely free economy?

Mr. TOWER. The period of 4 to 6 years is perhaps an arbitrary time, but it is one that I have discussed with farmers and representatives of farm organizations. They feel that that period would probably be an appropriate period of time for phasing out the program.

I am convinced that the U.S. Government can and should do more to open doors to U.S. farm exports. Our State Department should stand up for American farmers and bargain more effectively

for their interests than they have in the past. The potentials are tremendous. This is a proper and important role for Government.

The dynamic push of the free-enterprise way is stupendous. No other system can provide comparable progress, satisfaction, accomplishments.

It is my conviction that a free-enterprise farm economy will be more prosperous, will provide greater opportunities for individuals, and will result in a healthier and more satisfactory rural life than a farm economy that is managed by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, the end that I see would not be accomplished merely by the adoption of the amendment. As I have said before, and feel I should emphasize again, the amendment would not change any existing farm program. It would merely direct the Secretary of Agriculture to propound a plan which he would submit to the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The Secretary of Agriculture would submit the plan to the Congress. The Congress could decide whether or not the plan was feasible. There would be ample time for committee hearings, for testimony, for measuring public reaction, and obtaining the sentiment of the farmers generally. So I urge the adoption of my amendment to the farm bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The amendment would not impose any time limit on the Secretary in submitting a plan. Congress could act or refrain from acting, and there would be no time limit on the Congress.

Mr. TOWER. There would be no time limit. The Secretary would be merely directed to propound a plan which would call for a phasing out in a period of not less than 4 years and not more than 6.

Of course, Congress could, if it chose to follow the broad outline of such a plan, determine its own expedient times.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Texas to indicate Farm Bureau Federation approval of the amendment, or did I misunderstand the Senator?

Mr. TOWER. Will the Senator restate his question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does the Farm Bureau Federation approve the amendment or disapprove it, or does it take no position on the amendment?

Mr. TOWER. I cannot say that the Farm Bureau has an official position on the amendment. But I believe that the proposal is consonant with Farm Bureau Federation policy, and in my discussions with the representatives of the Farm Bureau Federation—speaking, of course, informally—they assure me that it is consonant.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I asked that question of the Senator because, as a mem-

ber of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I have heard representatives of the Farm Bureau Federation testify a number of times on a proposal, in which they are interested, which would take more land out of production and not put more in. As I understand, their solution calls for a substantial reduction of the amount of land now in production, which would seem to go exactly contrary to the proposal of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. It is my impression that the amendment is generally accepted. All the amendment provides is a direction to the Secretary of Agriculture to propound a plan. We could take the plan, analyze it, examine it, and go over it. We would have adequate opportunity to obtain reaction from the various farm organizations and farmers. We would then know what the sentiment was. We would be able more adequately to gauge it, because we would have something on which to hang our hats.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The difficulty is that virtually every other segment of our society, and every other economic group, has some kind of substantial rigidity or support. Organized labor has a minimum wage, which Congress has provided. There is almost no chance of that law being repealed. Businesses of various kinds are subsidized. I wish many of those laws could be repealed. There is no chance of repealing them. If we deprive the farmers of what little support they now receive, with their already low income, we may do great harm.

The Senator has called attention to the magnificent job which the farmers have done. The Senator from Texas has indicated that farmers have increased their efficiency three times as rapidly as have those off the farm. American farmers are the marvel of the world. Under those circumstances it seems to me that even to suggest a plan—and I recognize that the Senator's proposal is a moderate one; and he is not suggesting that we should take action now—along the lines proposed would be contrary to economic justice, because farm income is already so low. I cannot imagine the consequences of the Senator's proposal would be anything but to drive the income of farmers even lower than it is under present circumstances.

Mr. TOWER. There would be virtually no consequences of my proposal so far as present existing farm programs are concerned. All I am asking for is a program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Has all of my time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-five minutes of the Senator's time has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nineteen minutes.

Mr. TOWER. I should like to address myself to another point made by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. There are subsidies in other areas of the

economy. That is true. It is my hope that we might apply the suggested approach to some of those areas one of these days. My proposal is merely a beginning. All I am asking for is a plan. Let us see if there is anything new under the sun. Let us not be afraid to try something bold and imaginative. I am not a New Frontiersman, but I believe that we conservatives can come up with something bold and imaginative from time to time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to support the Senator's proposal, but I should like to assure myself on certain points. To follow up what the Senator from Wisconsin has said, there is no reason for Congress to support in full any plan proposed by the Secretary. The plan could be modified so that some of the subsidies could be maintained in instances in which they would be helpful to the farmer in the future. What the Senator is trying to do is to propose a comprehensive plan that would cover all farm problems.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator is correct. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is emphasizing that, after all, what we are asking for is a plan. I think everyone agrees that the farm economy is in a mess. Present programs are really not satisfactory. We wallow in our own frustration every year when we consider farm legislation. It must end at some time. Let us have a plan that would call for ending it. Let us then look at the plan. After we have studied the plan, if, in our estimation, it would result in complete economic ruin for the farmer, we could reject it. But let us have a plan. Let us have something to proceed from.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Apropos of what our friend from Wisconsin has said, there are subsidies in other phases of the economy. The network of subsidies is most impressive when we look at them. But the Senator from Texas is directing his thought toward a network of subsidies which has resulted in our acquiring approximately \$9 billion worth of farm products through the Commodity Credit Corporation. In other words, we have become the owner of this enormous sum, and for that reason have undertaken an expense of \$500 million or more to store and pay the interest on the money involved in this enormous concentration of farm products. Is that not so?

Mr. TOWER. That is correct.

Mr. BUSH. I point out that the subsidies involved in the farm program are different, because they have resulted in the Treasury being involved to the extent of more than \$9 billion at the present time, I believe. The most recent figure I have seen was of that order. The other subsidies have not resulted in anything like the accumulation of assets of dubious value that the farm program has produced.

Mr. TOWER. That is correct. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for pointing that out. We might further

note that very often a tax incentive is called a subsidy. That is a far more dynamic thing, which produces sources of wealth, whereas the farm subsidies take money out of the pocket of one person and put it in the pocket of another. That is not a dynamic force in the economy. It is a static force.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Earlier I was impressed by the argument made by the Senator from Louisiana that something had to be done which would contribute to the adoption of a permanent plan to eliminate the extravagant costs to which we have been subjected through the years. He argued that the way to do it was to give the Secretary of Agriculture power to reduce subsidies and thus compel greater compliance. In my judgment a new approach is needed to solve this problem. When I say a new approach, I predicate it primarily on the basis that the Ohio farmer, at least, wants to be emancipated from Government controls. He wants to have restored to him the right to operate his own farm. I subscribe to that idea. That restoration cannot be made abruptly. There must be a normal transition. I am convinced that we cannot solve this problem by legislative fiat, regardless of the wisdom we exercise, unless our declarations are in some way in conformity with natural laws.

Through the years we have tried to control natural laws. They have repeatedly lifted their voices and said: "Regardless of the might of the U.S. Congress, these natural laws are supreme, and you are not going to be able to change them."

That is what we face. I stated earlier today that when a problem is pointed up, we hasten to solve it. We solve that particular problem, but in the solution of it we create additional new problems. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana in his view that something new must be done. I subscribe to the proposal of the Senator from Texas that a plan should be submitted, and that in the evolution of that plan the Farmers Union, the Farm Bureau Federation, the Grange, economists, and others should be consulted. A view can be taken of the disappointments which have occurred in the past 30 years, and an analysis can be made of the huge costs, and finally consideration should be given to the pronouncement that we have made each year that we have now found the solution, although the same story is told each year, and we have gotten nowhere, except to sink into more and more difficulty.

I will support the Senator from Texas. His proposal is in accord with what the Senator from Louisiana says needs to be done. There must be some new approach to the problem.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio for pointing out that we are tampering with natural laws when we invade the economy, and do things to try to create an artificial supply and an artificial demand. We must not tamper too much with the balance of nature. I remember that in

my State at one time a bounty was put on hawks, because hawks occasionally would steal a chicken or two. Then the cotton rats became so numerous that it became necessary to take the bounty off hawks so that the hawks could kill the cotton rats. So I say we cannot tamper too much with the natural laws and expect to preserve a healthy economy.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to point out how the effort to solve a problem in one place creates a new one. In Ohio, the wheat which we produce is not in excess. The fact is that there is a scarcity of it. Yet under the proposed law there would be the same application with regard to wheat which is scarce and wheat which is in surplus. Certificates would be issued. A subsidy will go to the growers of inferior wheat, on the same basis that a subsidy goes to the producers of superior wheat. The bill demonstrates what happens when we try by legislative declarations to deal with delicate situations.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was glad to join the able Senator from Texas as a co-author of the amendment for the reason that I think it is common sense to request the Secretary of Agriculture to study the idea of phasing out the Government farm program over a period of 4 to 6 years. I do not believe that any Senator feels that farm programs over the past 30 years have been successful.

I do not believe any farmers feel that they have been successful. Our population is increasing, and the demand for foodstuffs is increasing. It is good, common sense for Congress to ask the Secretary of Agriculture, who has all the facts concerning this subject, to come forth with a plan to phase out the Government's control of agriculture over a period of 4 to 6 years. I agree we cannot phase it out in 1 year or 2 years. It seems to me that both Congress and the administration, whether it be a Democratic or a Republican administration, should give a great deal of thought to this subject. I know the farmers are doing it. I call attention to the fact that farm products that are at the moment not under controls are doing well. One of the troubles at the moment is that we have thrown the whole farm economy completely out of gear. We have helped here and hurt there. For that reason I am happy to support the amendment, and I am happy to be a co-author of it, because I think we ought to start giving some real attention to phasing the program out over a period of years in a way that will not hurt anyone. It is time that Congress asked the Secretary of Agriculture to give his best effort to this end.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas had a discussion with the Senator from Wisconsin about the position of the Farm Bureau Federation. I believe I know what the sit-

uation is. The Farm Bureau says that 28 million acres of land are in the conservation reserve. It suggests that the conservation reserve be brought up to 65 million acres.

It suggests that there be a period of phaseout of from 5 to 6 years, in which the farmer would gradually be liberated from the controls to which he is now subjected. But basically the Farm Bureau wants emancipation for the farmer. It wants a fair return to the farmer, and it believes it could be achieved by having the farmer voluntarily enter the conservation reserve, where the acreage would be brought up to 65 million or more, if need be.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I am curious as to why the Senator chooses the Secretary of Agriculture for this purpose. I should say that the present Secretary of Agriculture is unsympathetic to the kind of plan which the Senator from Texas has in mind, and probably would be unsympathetic to the kind of plan I would have in mind. Why would we not be better off, if this be a serious proposal, to designate a commission to devise a plan far more representative of the point of view of the author of the amendment and those who support him, rather than the Secretary of Agriculture, who would be completely hostile to it? That is what puzzles me about the amendment. Is it only a *de marche* to the Secretary of Agriculture, when we know he is completely hostile to such a plan and would be most unsympathetic to it?

I believe the Republican Party ought to propose a program of its own, and not merely ask the Secretary of Agriculture to draft one for us. For the Republican Party to submit its own plan would be fruitful and useful for the Nation. This is what concerns me about the Senator's amendment.

Mr. TOWER. I believe the Department of Agriculture is more competent by reason of experience, personnel, and resources, to undertake this work. I should like to think that even though the Secretary of Agriculture might not be sympathetic to my proposal—indeed, I doubt whether he would ever be sympathetic to anything I might propose—nonetheless, he would be sufficiently diligent and conscious of his responsibilities to pursue the study with vigor.

Mr. JAVITS. Even if this proposal should fail, the Senator has put his finger on one thing which troubles me. The Committee on Economic Development is studying the question now, with a view to developing a program. Such a program involves other considerations, including the mobility of labor, not merely land reserves; it involves the training of workers off the farm and their relocation. This is a really big project. I hope our party will address itself to it. I should like to work with the Senator from Texas, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and others, in drafting an alternate plan which would stand on its merits, and as to which, when we cast a vote, it would

not be as if we were casting it in a vacuum.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand, the amendment would add a new title to provide for a direction to the Secretary of Agriculture to submit to Congress proposals for legislation, first, to increase acreage allotments and marketing quotas annually until they are removed entirely; and second, to reduce price supports annually until they are removed entirely.

The Secretary would be required to submit such a proposal within 120 days after the enactment of the bill; and controls and supports would have to be completely removed not more than 6 years, nor less than 4 years after the enactment of the bill.

I have been a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for 26 years. I find that the farmers of the Nation do not ask for quotas. They would not seek to have price supports, if only other segments of our economic society were similarly treated.

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin made a significant point when he said that the costs of the farmers have been increased because of the minimum wage law. Then, too, there is the old Wagner Act, which is still on the statute books, but is now known as the Taft-Hartley Act. Around the bargaining table the workers and employers have agreed upon wages which have caused an increase in the prices of things which farmers need.

The proposal of the distinguished Senator from Texas would not only abolish some programs that may have cost much money and some programs that may have been bad, but would also eliminate all programs, even marketing agreements, such as those which affect Florida and California, and many of the provisions for the marketing of milk and other products.

We may criticize all these programs as much as we will; yet they have been instrumental in enabling the farmers to produce much more on fewer acres than was true in the past. When I first came to Congress, in 1937, 42 million acres of land were required to produce the amount of cotton which is now produced on about 16½ million acres. The same is true of many other commodities.

In the long run, although many programs have been costly to the Government, still they have been beneficial, in that many uneducated farmers, because of the incentive which was offered to them, have been able to produce much more on a given acreage.

In our own country, land resources are very limited. As I recall, there are about half a billion acres of land on which we can really depend. Our population is increasing at the rate of more than 3 million a year, and there is a loss of about 2 million acres of our best land each year. It does not require a smart person to calculate that with an increase in population and a decrease in land resources, the time will soon come when it will be necessary to increase production on the limited acres which will remain.

These programs have been instrumental in getting farmers—not only

farmers who are college graduates, but many farmers who do not even know how to read or write—to produce more and more on their land. I think the programs, as a whole, have been good.

It is also my belief that if the programs had been managed from their inception in accordance with the will of Congress, the cost would not have been so great. When a good program is in the hands of farmers, it is difficult to wean them away from it. A classic example is one I have been discussing yesterday and today with respect to corn and other feed grains, as well as wheat. The program for milk and the products of milk is another classic program under which large amounts have been produced, much more than were needed.

It strikes me that it will cost quite a few dollars to make the study that is proposed by the Senator from Texas; and I doubt that it will be of benefit to Congress.

For that reason, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject this amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield very briefly to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG of Missouri in the chair.) Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Louisiana recall that about 2 or 3 years ago the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had a study made by some of the land-grant colleges in regard to the economic impact of such an amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Such an amendment would be disastrous to the economy.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I was about to ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD excerpts from that study, which the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had made in 1959. I have a copy of it in my office. The study indicates the severe losses which would be suffered by the farmers of the country under such an amendment and the violence which the amendment would do to our economy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD excerpts from that report—which, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, was made by a committee of land-grant college economists, in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture, under Mr. Benson.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT FROM THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AND A STATEMENT FROM THE LAND GRANT COLLEGES IRR-1 ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FARM PRICE AND INCOME PROJECTIONS 1960-65, UNDER CONDITIONS APPROXIMATING FREE PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

(86th Cong., 2d sess., S. Doc. No. 77)

FOREWORD

This report shows that farm prices would fall substantially and production would continue to increase by about 2 percent per year if all acreage controls (except tobacco) were removed and price supports were at levels which would permit an orderly reduction of currently excessive stocks of storable

agricultural commodities over a 7- to 10-year period.

Increased marketings would result in average farm prices of about 90 cents per bushel for wheat; 80 cents a bushel for corn, with other feed grain prices in proportion; \$3 per hundredweight for rice; 25 cents a pound for cotton; \$15 per 100 pounds for beef cattle; \$11.20 per 100 pounds for hogs; \$3.80 per 100 pounds for milk at wholesale; 29 cents a dozen for eggs; and 15 cents a pound for broilers. Production and prices are shown in tables 6 and 7 of the Department's report.

As estimated by the Advisory Committee realized net farm income would drop to \$7 billion by 1965, about 46 percent below the 1958 level.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—PROJECTIONS OF PRODUCTION AND PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS FOR 1960-65 ACCORDING TO SPECIFIED ASSUMPTIONS

Summary

Projections of probable market supplies and prices for the major farm commodities for the period 1960-65 presented here have been prepared at the request of Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Senator ELLENDER's request specified that the projections should be made under assumptions that all production controls except those on tobacco were removed and price supports were maintained at levels which would permit an orderly reduction over a 7- to 10-year period in the currently excessive stocks of storable farm commodities.

Under these assumed conditions, total farm output would increase to 137 percent of the 1947-49 average by 1965. This would be 20 percent higher than the 1955-57 average of 114 percent. Compared to current indications for 1959, the projected increase would be around 10 percent. The increase above 1955-57 in output of livestock would be 25 percent and that for crops would be 16 percent. The greater increase in livestock output would result from favorable livestock-feed price ratios. Livestock output at the projected level would reduce feed grain stocks by 7 million tons per year and require the use of substantial quantities of wheat for feed.

The projected population figure for 1965 is 195.7 million, an increase of 16 percent from 1955-57. Per capita disposable income at \$2,120 in 1965 is 22 percent above 1955-57.

Projected cash receipts from farm marketings at \$30.6 billion would be 2 percent higher than the 1955-57 average. Cash receipts from livestock and products at \$17.7 billion would be 7 percent higher, and those from crops at \$12.9 billion would be 4 percent lower.

Although the projected cash receipts figure is a little higher than the 1955-57 figure, it is 9 percent lower than the \$33.6 billion figure for 1958. In that year, a number of unusual factors contributed to an increase in cash receipts.

The projected index of prices received by farmers would be 193 for 1965, 17 percent below the 1955-57 average.

At 184, prices received for crops would be down a little more than the total index, and prices received for livestock and products at 200 would be down somewhat less than the total.

The projected increase in farm output would imply a per capita food consumption index of about 108 (1947-49=100) for 1965, about 5 percent higher than in 1955-57. Per capita consumption of food livestock products would be 8 percent higher with meat, including poultry meat, accounting for all of the increase. Per capita food use of crops would be practically the same as the 1955-57 average.

These projections are indications of the probable situation under the assumptions specified by Senator ELLENDER. Neither the analysis nor the leading assumptions should be regarded as forecasts or as an endorsement or an analysis of any proposed farm program.

Agricultural assumptions and approaches
Acreages and Programs

As specified in the original request, the projections assume the elimination of acreage and production controls for all major commodities except tobacco. In general, price support is assumed at levels which would permit an orderly liquidation of current excessive stocks over a 7- to 10-year period. The assumptions for wheat and cotton were modified by an additional assumption that the orderly liquidation of stocks could be handled through special programs, such as Public Law 480. However, Public Law 480 would by no means be limited to stock liquidation. Thus, the price support level assumed is one that would avoid further accumulation of stocks. In addition, programs such as section 32, special milk, school lunch, Sugar Act, Wool Act, marketing agreements and orders are assumed to continue in effect without significant change.

Certain actions with respect to price supports and/or acreage allotments in 1960, which conflict with the assumptions for these projections, are disregarded. This includes the marketing quotas for wheat, cotton, rice, peanuts, and tobacco which have already been approved by growers and the minimum price support already announced for wheat.

A conservation reserve program of 30 million acres is assumed, an increase of 8 million acres over 1959. This assumption implies appropriations and authorizations at about current levels and some reduction in payment per acre associated with the lower prices of farm products. Estimates of normal use of the land in conservation reserve in 1959 were used in projection of the effects of the expansion in the program during the 1960-65 period. Feed grains, wheat, hay, cropland pasture, crop failure, and fallow represented the major normal use of cropland reserve acreages in 1959.

The total acreage of cropland and pasture was assumed to remain at the 1959 level during the 1960-65 period. It was assumed that in the first year the elimination of allotments on wheat and cotton, together with the increased soil bank, would result in reduced fallow and idle acreages. Consequently, the total land used for crops and the soil bank would increase.

After the first year, however, the lower price level would encourage reductions in harvested cropland. While the acreage adjustments to the lower price levels would not be completed by 1965, some increase in idle and fallow would be expected. Because of the problems inherent in resource adjustment and the difficulties of shifting land use in a relatively short period, the decrease in harvested cropland was projected at about 1 million acres per year. This general acreage framework is indicated in table 2.

Projection of individual crop acreages were made by means of a series of approximations. Factors considered included suspension of allotments on wheat and cotton and conservation reserve expansion, prospective price-cost relations, the livestock-feed balance, and recent trends. The evaluation of these factors necessarily involved large elements of judgment.

Yields

Yield projections for the period 1960-65, developed in cooperation with ARS natural scientists, were used as a general framework for the yield estimates of major crops. The yield projections include the increases that agricultural research scientists expect to re-

sult from further application of known improvements. The original yield projections were made in the general context of current acreages and price-cost relations.¹ It was felt, however, that in a period of only 5 years, effects of lower price-cost relationships on yields would be minor because of the continued profitability from the standpoint of the individual farmer of marginal increases in the use of fertilizer, improved varieties, and other yield-increasing techniques that are presently available. Acreage shifts are likely to be of particular significance to yields of cotton and grain sorghums.

Trends in yield per acre of feed grains, as indicated by the projections, were expected to continue to increase in the years 1960-65. But the annual rates of increase in the next 5 years would be less than in the years since 1940. Further, the yields of corn and grain sorghum in 1958 and 1959 were apparently significantly above the indicated trends because of favorable weather.

Yield increases in corn will reflect to a large extent the increases in fertilizer and associated practices. Corn yields in 1965 would be slightly below the record yields indicated for 1958 and 1959. Yields of sorghum grain are expected to increase chiefly as the result of additional plantings of improved hybrid varieties. However, the projected rate of increase in grain sorghums is considerably less than in recent years.

Trends in hay yields are expected to increase gradually during the 1960-65 period with improvements in production practices and types of hay. Hay production by 1965 might be at approximately the record level achieved in 1958. Despite wide fluctuations, the long-term trend in the total feed consumed from pasture has been upward as pastures have been improved. This trend is expected to continue. Total feed units available from pasture by 1965 may be about 5 percent above the 1957-58 feeding year.

Wheat and cotton yields were projected to increase gradually during the period at about the same rate as the long-term upward trend in yields for these crops.

Average or normal weather must be assumed in projections of this nature, since there is no prior basis for any other assumption. In effect, weather is held constant throughout the projection period, with any above average years approximately balanced by below average years. A run of several years, either above or below average, during the projection period could result in substantially different results.

Similarly, the projections for hogs are primarily in terms of trend values, rather than projections of a cyclical pattern. For given years in the period, cyclical influences might well result in hog production either higher or lower than the trend value for that year. Attempting to project cyclical as well as trend values for specific years would imply a much higher degree of precision in the available methods than actually exists. Furthermore, the emphasis here is on the relative situation during the projection period, rather than on either the situation in a given year or the change from one year to the next.

General results

Under the assumed conditions total farm output would increase to 137 percent of the 1947-49 average by 1965. This would be 20 percent higher than the 1955-57 average of 114 percent. Compared to current indications for 1959, the projected increase would be around 10 percent. The increase above

¹ A detailed discussion of these projections is contained in a report, "Wheat, Feed, and Livestock Production Projections" by R. P. Christensen, S. E. Johnson, and R. V. Bowman, FERD, ARS which is in process of publication.

1955-57 in output of livestock would be 25 percent, and that for crops would be 16 percent. The greater increase in livestock output would result from favorable livestock-feed price ratios. Livestock output at the projected level would reduce feed grain stocks by 7 million tons per year and require the use of substantial quantities of wheat for feed.

As indicated earlier, the projected population figure for 1965 is 195.7 million, an increase of 16 percent from 1955-57. Per capita disposable income at \$2,120 in 1965 is 22 percent above 1955-57.

Projected cash receipts from farm marketings at \$30.6 billion would be 2 percent higher than the 1955-57 average. Cash receipts from livestock and products at \$17.7 billion would be 7 percent higher and those from crops at \$12.9 billion would be 4 percent lower.

Although the projected cash receipts figure is a little higher than the 1955-57 figure, it is 9 percent lower than the \$33.6 billion figure for 1958. In that year, a number of unusual factors contributed to an increase in cash receipts.

The projected index of prices received by farmers would be 193 for 1965, 17 percent below the 1955-57 average.

At 184, prices received for crops would be down a little more than the total index, and prices received for livestock and products at 200 would be down somewhat less than the total.

The projected increase in farm output would imply a per capita food consumption index of about 108 (1947-49=100) for 1965, about 5 percent higher than in 1955-57. Per capita consumption of food livestock products would be 8 percent higher with meat, including poultry meat, accounting for all of the increase. Per capita food use of crops would be practically the same as the 1955-57 average.

STATEMENT BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE²

The report prepared by the staff of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is a thorough and comprehensive analysis of the important question raised by Senator ELLENDER. In view of the uncertainty of the future it is not possible to make projections of the requested kind with a high degree of precision. Further, the projected price and income levels are so far outside the range of recent experience that it is difficult to predict how farmers might react to these difficult conditions. In spite of these difficulties it is evident that care has been exercised in bringing together all available information in working out the numerous details.

Members of the committee, however, have certain reservations about the estimates and implied relationships projected through 1965. The generally high level of exports, especially of wheat and cotton, will be difficult to achieve, even with considerable use of Public Law 480 funds. The expected domestic consumption of cotton appears high and production somewhat low at the 1965 farm price. The projected volume of hogs might well depress farm prices by more than the indicated amount. For these reasons, among others, the committee believes that the average level of farm prices in the Department report is somewhat higher than is consistent with the projected volume of total farm marketings in 1965.

But if the prices and quantities estimated by the Department technicians should obtain under the conditions specified, cash income from farm marketings in the period 1960-65 would be expected to total about the same as in 1955-57 or \$30.6 billion a

year. This level of cash receipts from farm marketings would be maintained in spite of a sharp drop in market prices because of continued annual increases in farm production of about 2 percent a year.

Farms in 1965 would be producing about 20 percent more products than in 1955-57. The effect of lower farm prices on output is expected to be minor because of the continued profitability for the individual farmer of marginal increases in presently available output increasing techniques.

Under these conditions the larger marketings would result in U.S. average farm prices of about 80 cents a bushel for corn with other feed grain prices in proportion, 90 cents a bushel for wheat, \$3 per 100 pounds for rice, 25 cents a pound for cotton, \$15 per 100 pounds for beef cattle (\$22 per hundred for choice, grain-fattened steers in Chicago), \$11.20 per 100 pounds for hogs, \$3.60 per 100 pounds for milk at wholesale, 29 cents a dozen for eggs and 15 cents a pound for broilers.

Under the Department of Agriculture's projections carryover stocks would be reduced as follows: Feed grains, from 80 million tons in 1959 to 38 million in 1965; wheat, from 1.4 billion bushels to 0.4 billion; and cotton from 8.9 million to 7.2 million bales.

The bulk of these carryover stocks would continue to be in Government ownership and storage.

Net income

Since the Department of Agriculture was not asked to estimate effects on net farm income, the Committee undertook this analysis. Production expenses would be expected to be higher in 1965 than in 1955-57 because (a) the report assumes further increases in fertilization and other means of increasing output, and (b) the parity index in 1955-57, at 280, was lower than the level assumed for the report, 300. Production expenses in 1959 already were \$3.4 billion higher than in 1955-57, and are expected to continue to increase about 1 percent a year even though nonfarm prices stabilize at present levels. Although the larger volume of marketings would maintain cash receipts at the 1955-57 level in spite of lower prices, realized net farm income would drop from \$11.5 billion in the earlier period to about \$7 billion in 1965 because of higher production expenses. This is a reduction of almost 40 percent.

The reduction in realized net income would be borne largely by the 2.1 million farms which market 90 percent of all farm products. The number of these farms held constant at 2.1 million between 1944 and 1954; hence, only a small reduction in numbers is expected in the 1960-65 period. Also, the off-farm income of families on these farms increased at a rate of only \$60 per family per year in 1952-56. Therefore, little hope can be held out that increases in off-farm income would be an important offset to declining farm income for these families in the 1960-65 period.

The expected net farm income of \$7 billion in the 1960-65 period is based on a continuation of the sugar and wool programs making direct payments to farmers of \$120 to \$130 million a year, agricultural conservation program payments of \$225 million a year, and conservation reserve program payments of \$300 to \$325 million.

In addition, in these projections, cash receipts from farm marketings are supported by surplus removal purchases under section 32, marketing agreement programs, and a continuation of Public Law 480 exports at about present dollar levels.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Louisiana when the study was made.

Mr. ELLENDER. In 1959.

Mr. TOWER. In other words, it was made 3 years ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota stated that the effect of the amendment would be disastrous. In response let me again emphasize that the amendment would not change any existing farm program. We would merely call on the Department of Agriculture to present us with a plan. Then, at our option, we could either accept it or reject it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to say that the Secretary of Agriculture already is working on, and has presented, programs which he believes, according to his best judgment and according to the best judgment of those in his Department, would be best for the country.

The Senator from Texas votes against such programs, and wants the Secretary of Agriculture to present another program, one which has as its objective freeing the farmers from controls and raising the farmers' income. I cannot imagine that the Secretary of Agriculture, whose program has already been rejected by the author of this amendment, would be able to present a program which would be much more acceptable to the author of the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am willing to yield back the remainder of the time under my control, if the Senator from Texas will do likewise.

Mr. TOWER. I am prepared to do the same, except that I wish to say, first, that it occurs to me that the Secretary of Agriculture might become more enlightened after making such a study, and might be able to come forward with a beneficial program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Secretary of Agriculture is already a very enlightened man, indeed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. TOWER. I am ready to do the same, Mr. President.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President—

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Minnesota that when we oppose the Department of Agriculture on a program, I believe we do so as a result of a composite of the knowledge which has been gained by various Members of the Senate on our side, living in all sections of the country; and I do not believe that can be easily fended off.

I often think of the story about a man who went to the Corcoran Art Gallery, in the city of Washington, and, while looking at a painting there, began to make a great many adverse comments.

A man came up to him, and asked, "Are you an artist?"

The man who had been making the adverse comments replied, "No."

The other man asked, "Then why do you make all these criticisms and capricious remarks about that painting, if you aren't an artist?"

The man who had been making the comments looked at the other man and said, "Well, I don't know who you are."

The reply was, "I am the artist who painted that picture."

² Professors Halvorson, Wisconsin, chairman; George Brandow, Pennsylvania; Willard Cochrane, Minnesota; Maurice Kelso, Arizona; James Plaxico, Oklahoma; and John Schnittker, Kansas.

The other man said, "Then let me tell you, in justification, that I ain't no chicken, but I know when an egg is rotten."

So, Mr. President, we do not have to be Secretaries of Agriculture in order to know when a program is bad. On the basis of that logic and discernment, of course we deliver our judgments accordingly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator's story is a better art story than an agricultural story.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). All remaining time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senators from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] and Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Sen-

ator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON and Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 55, as follows:

[No. 212 Leg.]

YEAS—17

Beall	Fong	Saltonstall
Bennett	Goldwater	Smith, Maine
Bush	Hruska	Thurmond
Capehart	Jordan, Idaho	Tower
Dirksen	Lausche	Wiley
Dodd	Pearson	

NAYS—55

Aiken	Holland	Monroney
Bartlett	Humphrey	Morse
Bottum	Jackson	Moss
Burdick	Javits	Mundt
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston	Muskie
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Pell
Carlson	Keating	Prouty
Case	Kefauver	Proxmire
Cooper	Kerr	Randolph
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Smith, Mass.
Douglas	Long, Hawaii	Sparkman
Ellender	Long, La.	Stennis
Ervin	Magnuson	Talmadge
Fulbright	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Gore	McClellan	Yarborough
Hart	McGee	Young, N. Dak.
Hartke	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Hickenlooper	Metcalf	
Hill	Miller	

NOT VOTING—28

Allott	Cotton	Neuberger
Anderson	Eastland	Pastore
Bible	Engle	Robertson
Boggs	Gruening	Russell
Butler	Hayden	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Hickey	Smathers
Carroll	Kuchel	Symington
Chavez	McCarthy	Williams, Del.
Church	Morton	
Clark	Murphy	

So Mr. TOWER's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, since a number of our colleagues are still with us this evening, I want to ask, first, unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow,

the Senate vote on final passage of the farm bill; and if that request is granted, I will ask for the yeas and nays on passage.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question would be first, on the third reading.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wanted to make the unanimous-consent request that, after the third reading, which we hope to arrive at tonight, after the morning hour tomorrow there be a vote on passage of the farm bill.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, how much time will there be after the morning hour for any statement a Senator may wish to make?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that there would have to be a quorum call if an hour were fixed for voting on passage.

Are there further amendments to be offered?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Kentucky to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment it is proposed:

On page 89, line 16, after "area" insert "and".

On page 89, beginning with line 17, strike out all down through line 22.

On page 89, line 23, strike out "(5)" and insert in lieu thereof "(4)".

On page 89, line 25, immediately after the word "claimed" insert "or for which marketing quotas have been disapproved by producers".

Page 90, line 1, strike out "(6)" and insert in lieu thereof "(5)".

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the amendment I offer is quite simple. The effect of the amendments would be to maintain in the 1958 act the support price, at 50 percent of parity for wheat the event that, upon a referendum, the wheat growers should reject marketing quotas.

My purpose in offering the amendments is substantially that which was described when earlier today the change in the support price for corn was adopted.

Under the 1958 act, if growers of wheat reject quotas, a 50 percent support price is still afforded growers. The purpose of providing 50 percent support, in such a case is I am sure to assure an orderly marketing of wheat, and prevent extremely low prices and chaotic economic conditions, until some other program is devised or adjustments occur.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. May I complete my explanation, and then I will be glad to yield to my good friend.

Under the bill before the Senate, if growers should reject compulsory marketing quotas, the Secretary of Agriculture could fix support prices from 0 to 50 percent. This raises substantially

the same question as I raised regarding the change in support prices for corn.

In the event the compulsory wheat program offered by the administration should be rejected, farmers would get only 0 to 50 percent support price for their wheat. I contend that that would create a very disorderly marketing situation and be very bad for the farmers in a period of adjustment.

I make the point that that provision would give the farmers no real choice or alternative except to accept compulsory controls for wheat.

I do not want to appear to be inconsistent. I have voted for compulsory controls, in the sense that the farmers have approved them by referendum, for tobacco, cotton, rice, peanuts, and wheat. I have not voted for compulsory controls on feed grains because feed grains and the above crops differ. The crops I have named go on the market; feed grains are inherent to the use of his farm by the farmer.

I voted for the administration's proposal on wheat in the committee and in the Senate. But, the wheat farmer should have free opportunity to decide whether he wishes to have controls or not. Under the proposal which the administration sent to Congress, which is before us, the farmer would not have a fair choice. For he has no choice except a program supported by 0 to 50 percent supports. If he does not take the administration program he will have no program.

When we voted today to give to the Secretary of Agriculture the power to fix support prices at from 0 to 90 percent of parity for corn, and then denied him the power to add to the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, we voted out a corn program. I am more certain than when I spoke earlier.

I say we ought to give the farmer a fair deal and a choice with respect to wheat.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Under the amendment, if the farmers voted "no" in a referendum would they get 50 percent of parity price supports?

Mr. COOPER. The law today provides 50 percent for wheat, nothing for tobacco, 50 percent for peanuts, 50 percent for rice, and 50 percent for cotton.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. For the RECORD, What would the amendment the Senator has offered provide?

Mr. COOPER. It would maintain 50 percent of parity price supports for wheat, as is provided today, if farmers reject compulsory controls.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Under the present law the farmer would have to abide by acreage allotments to get 50-percent supports. Does the Senator's amendment so provide?

Mr. COOPER. Yes; it would retain the present law.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the amendment, 50 percent of parity would be paid to those who would comply with their allotments?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I shall be glad to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendments to the committee amendment were agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "8-17-62—J."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 94, between lines 17 and 18, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 405. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "Notwithstanding the foregoing, whenever the Secretary determines it necessary in order to assure the Nation an adequate supply of milk free of contamination by radioactive fallout, he may make feed owned or controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation available to producers of milk in any area or areas of the United States at such prices and on such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate in the public interest."

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I wish to add the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] as a cosponsor of the amendment.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD PAY COST OF USING STORED FEED TO PROTECT AGAINST FALLOUT

Mr. President, I have offered an amendment which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to absorb at least part of the extra cost of protecting milk against contamination by radioactive fallout, where this is a problem. I strongly hope that my amendment, which would extend the present livestock feed program for disaster areas to areas where pasture is contaminated by fallout, will be accepted and will be made part of the pending bill.

I recognize that hearings have not been conducted on this subject. However, it is of such urgency that I believe in this case we must act at once. Starting August 23—this Thursday—cows producing milk for sale in fluid markets in Minnesota will be fed stored feed. By this technique any risk of milk being contaminated by fallout is eliminated. The radioactive iodine 131, which is the source of the high radiation levels in Minnesota and elsewhere, has a relatively short half-life—so taking cows off pasture and putting them on feed that has been stored 30 days or more is an effective and feasible countermeasure.

But it is absolutely clear to this Senator that the extra cost of this countermeasure should not be borne by the individual farmers involved, or by the consumers of milk in the areas where iodine 131 contamination is or becomes a

problem. By the simple step of extending the livestock feed program to cover the "disaster" of pastures contaminated by fallout, it will be possible for this cost to be fairly shared.

What is more, I can think of no better use for the Government-owned stocks of feed grains, which critics of farm programs consider so excessive. As a matter of fact, feed grain stocks are now down to a little more than a 5 months' supply. Already one entire State is going to divert cows from pasture to stored feed. In the light of the large expenditures that have been made for civil defense in recent years, this investment in a safe, protected, fallout-free food supply is wise and prudent.

My amendment extends an already functioning program in a simple and logical way. No new administrative set-up would have to be established. The same staff employees who now operate the livestock feed program for disaster areas could run the extended program too. Because the impact of fallout contamination is not fully known as yet, my amendment also would give the Secretary discretion to set the terms and conditions under which stored CCC feed could be made available.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Times of August 19 discussing the diversion of milk cows from pasture to stored feed in Minnesota be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILK PLAN FIGHTS IODINE 131 DANGER—MINNESOTA WILL PAY FARMERS TO GIVE COWS AGED FEED

MINNEAPOLIS, August 18.—In a program aimed at reducing possible danger of iodine 131 concentration in milk, Minnesota's milk producers will be paid a premium for milk from herds fed on aged feed.

The voluntary program is scheduled to start next week with participation of most grade A milk producers and processors in the State. It will pay the farmers a bonus of 45 cents a hundredweight for class 1 milk (fluid milk) from cows that have been taken out of pasture. The feed given these cows must have been stored under shelter at least 21 days. During such a period, iodine 131 loses most of its radioactivity.

State agriculture officials emphasized that concentrations of iodine 131 were not at a dangerous level in Minnesota. The new program is aimed at avoiding any danger by making possible the collection of "clean" milk that could, if necessary, be blended with other milk to reduce its iodine level.

Farmers, told of the program at local meeting, have generally been receptive. The duration of the program is uncertain, but it could continue until late fall, when farmers normally move their herds from pasture to winter quarters.

MAY BRING PRICE RISE

The program may result in an increase of 1 cent a quart in the retail price of milk.

One of the largest participants will be the Twin City Milk Producers Association, whose 2,600 farmer producers provide most of the fluid milk for the Minneapolis-St. Paul area.

Walter Larson, association president, said in a letter to farmer members that "the cumulative total of iodine 131 in our milk supply is increasing at a slow rate."

But, he said, as a result of Russian nuclear testing it "will probably increase faster and

reach objectionable levels unless corrective measures are taken."

Mr. Larson's letter added:

"Every producer who can should promptly convert to aged feeding to preserve and protect his fluid market. If sufficient number of producers sign affidavits to voluntarily take the corrective action of aged feeding, iodine 131 counts can be lowered so it may not be necessary for regulatory groups to take more drastic action or to make public announcements of the situation."

MILK DIVERTED IN UTAH

Earlier this month milk producers in northeastern Utah were ordered to divert milk from certain areas there from Salt Lake City because of a sharp rise in the content of radioactive iodine 131.

Dr. G. D. Carlyle Thompson, State health director, attributed the rise to atomic test explosions in Nevada. On July 6, he noted, the level of iodine 131 in the areas was not detectable, but it jumped to 1,660 micromicrocuries a liter of milk on July 20. It dropped to 450 for a few days and then rose to 2,050 on July 25, he noted.

A curie is the amount of radiation given off by one gram of radium. A micromicrocurie is a millionth part of a millionth of a curie. A liter is slightly more than a liquid quart. The recommended limit of radiation for a human being is 36,000 micromicrocuries a year.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, just this afternoon Mr. Tom Pattison, the Farmers Home Administration director for Wisconsin, arrived in my office bearing a memorandum and statement from our Wisconsin State Disaster Committee recommending that the livestock feed program be extended to cover contamination of pasture by radioactive fallout.

Tom Pattison is himself a dairy farmer. He has himself had to sign a producer's warranty stating that his own cows will be fed only stored feed beginning this Thursday, August 23. He thus knows from personal experience, as well as from his position as State FHA director, what is involved in providing protection from fallout contamination for milk. He has told me that unless a Federal program such as I have proposed is immediately authorized individual dairy farmers will suffer serious financial injury. Even if the price of milk to consumers in affected areas is raised a penny a quart, as is proposed in Minneapolis-St. Paul, the financial increment to dairy farmers will not be sufficient to cover the added costs. What is more, I deplore this method of paying the costs. Individual consumers should not have to pay the price of nuclear tests than should individual farmers. This is a national problem and it needs to be solved on a national level.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum, statement, warranty, and other information provided by Mr. Pattison be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 17, 1962.

To: Wisconsin State Disaster Committee.
From: Douglas County Disaster Committee.
Subject: Request for extension livestock feed program.

We, hereby, request extension of the livestock feed program to December 15, 1962, at 75 percent of price support due to fallout. Please advise.

ROBERT L. FARLEY, Chairman.

MINUTES OF THE DOUGLAS COUNTY DISASTER COMMITTEE

DOUGLAS, WIS.

The committee met on Friday, August 17, 1962, at 1:30 p.m. in the ASCS county office. Present: Robert L. Farley, chairman; Raymond E. Polzin, county agent; Virginia E. Gunn, secretary.

The chairman called the meeting together for the purpose of discussing continuing the livestock feed program for next year. The third member, William Bernard O'Sullivan (FHA) could not be present but was in favor of the extension.

An aged feeding program is scheduled for this area (including Douglas County) to offset the possibility of radioactive substance (iodine 131) which can be accumulated in the milk.

To assure the public of good wholesome milk, the aged feeding program will begin September 1, 1962, and be carried on for at least 6 weeks. This program requires considerably more grain than would normally be fed to replace the second crop pasture that we normally have available here during this period.

It was unanimously agreed to request the State disaster committee to extend the livestock feed program to December 15, 1962, at 75 percent of price support.

Respectfully submitted.

VIRGINIA E. GUNN,
Secretary.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS, STATE OF WISCONSIN, Superior, Wis., August 16, 1962.

DICK SCHUSTER.
EVERT WALLENFELDT.
VIC BUREALOW.
WALLACE MEHLBERG.

DEAR FRIENDS: Enclosed are some materials being used in explaining the iodine 131 situation to producers in this milk shed. We are now holding producer meetings to sign up for stored feeding. While many objections are voiced it appears that we have no choice but to comply. A premium of 20 cents per hundred will be paid for all who comply.

Wisconsin agents are a little uncertain about where we stand in this, but it looks like we have no choice but to cooperate with the dairy industry and try to prevent a consumer panic.

The question of Federal assistance keeps coming up. I'm sure there will be a request to reinstitute the livestock feed program. It will be a couple of weeks yet before our oats is harvested and then it can not be fed for 21 days. It seems like the Defense Department rather than USDA should be responsible for the cost of this program.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND E. POLZIN,
Douglas County Agent.

PRODUCER'S GUARANTEE WARRANTY

The undersigned, who is a grade A patron(s) delivering milk to Twin Ports Cooperative Dairy Association for his account, does hereby make the following warranty and guarantee:

1. That all grade A milk delivered for his account on and after August 31, 1962, will be from cows which have been fed entirely on aged feed. (Aged feed shall be feed which has been harvested, collected, and bunched into stacks or stored under shelter for at least 21 days.)

2. That he will continue shipping milk from cows fed aged feed until he is notified in writing that this guarantee warranty is terminated or until he has given Twin Ports Cooperative Dairy Association written notice 5 days in advance of the date he will discontinue this guarantee warranty.

3. That this guarantee warranty is made with the understanding that any premiums

collected in the sale of milk from cows fed aged feed or any other additional moneys collected by Twin Ports Cooperative Dairy Association specifically for this program will be distributed each month to all patrons who signed similar guarantee warranties and are delivering milk from cows fed aged feed, in addition to the regular price paid for grade A milk that month.

4. That, if he feeds his cows producing milk any feed other than aged feed during the period this guarantee warranty is in effect without giving notice as specified in paragraph 2 above, he will forfeit all right to any additional payments that month and agrees that in satisfaction of damages for breach of obligation his total milk deliveries for that month shall be paid for at the manufacturing grade II price.

5. During a period of alertness requiring aged feeding, cows shall be confined in an area that prevents miscellaneous grazing or eating unaged feed.

The undersigned hereby acknowledges reading and agreeing to the terms of this guarantee warranty.

Date signed _____.

(Producer's Signature).

(Producer's Signature).

AN AGED FEEDING PROGRAM TO REDUCE IODINE 131 LEVELS FOR FLUID MILK CONSUMPTION

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
July 30, 1962.

1. All milking animals must be removed from pasture and confined in a yard where no grazing is available. Fencing should be adequate to prevent accidental access to fresh pasture.

2. Grain and roughage fed to cattle must have been harvested and stacked, preferably under cover, for at least 21 days, as iodine 131 has a half-life of 8 days and it will be at a very low level after this period.

3. Cattle must not be fed field chopped hay or any other crop unless it has been held for at least 21 days.

4. If silage or haylage is to be fed it must have been in the silo for at least 21 days, therefore, two silos may be necessary if they are being filled and fed from at the same time or some other means devised to insure adequate storage time in the silo prior to feeding.

5. If canning plant refuse is being fed, care must be exercised to see that it has been harvested at least 21 days prior to feeding.

6. Freshening cows should be fed aged feed for at least 10 days prior to adding their milk to a bulk supply that is under an emergency aged feeding program.

FALLOUT AND THE MILK PRODUCER

You have all read or heard a great deal about fallout during the past months and have, no doubt, been confused and concerned about the effect it has on you, the milk producer. I will make an attempt this evening to give you a brief outline of the available information on the subject. I would like to emphasize that this presentation is not made to alarm you, but, on the contrary, is presented to provide you with an understanding of the problem before it becomes too critical and causes hasty action in a moment of panic. We are all subject to serious doubts about the unknown so I will try to anticipate your questions and provide answers. If you still have unanswered questions, ample time will be provided at the end of the presentation for individual questions. There is a lot still unknown about this subject and we certainly do not have all the answers, but will attempt to pass on to you what current knowledge we have.

WHAT IS FALLOUT?

This is a word used to cover the wide range of radioactive material that settles out of the air following the testing of atomic

bombs or other thermonuclear devices. The word is a general one and covers strontium, cesium, iodine, or any other material which is radioactive. There is a very important distinction between fallout from testing and that likely to be encountered in case of a nuclear war. The amounts of fallout from testing which are presently being discussed are very small, in contrast to heavy loads of fallout that might occur as a result of a release of an atomic bomb during wartime.

WHERE DOES IT COME FROM?

The entire world is constantly being covered by natural radiation from the sun, rocks, etc., but fallout, as discussed in the news media these days, is entirely man-made and results from the explosion of weapons or other devices. When a bomb is exploded the fallout material is released into the upper atmosphere and is moved around the world by winds at very high speeds. The radioactive material gradually settles out to the earth by means of rains, snow, settling dust, etc. You can see that explosions released anywhere in the world can cause fallout anywhere, depending to a large extent on weather conditions, and can continue for many years in the future. Because of these facts, we must remember we can be subject to fallout from tests made anywhere in the world and so have little control over the amount or extent of the fallout, even if we were to discontinue our own series of tests.

WHAT DOES FALLOUT MEAN TO THE MILK PRODUCER?

As you know, much of the publicity on fallout has, unfortunately, left the impression that milk contains more fallout than other forms of food. It should be understood that some of the reasons for testing milk are that it is universally produced every day, is used by a wide segment of the population, and is a convenient medium for testing. As much of the early testing was largely confined to milk, reports were usually in terms of the amount of fallout present in milk and the consuming public soon associated fallout with milk and, in some instances, may have been influenced to curtail their milk consumption. This trend is very important to the producers, as a reduction in consumption inevitably leads to lower prices to producers. If the trend continues and nothing is done, possible loss of markets for milk will be the result.

IS FALLOUT A PROBLEM FOR MILK ALONE?

In most cases the problem of fallout is just as serious for other foods as it is for milk, but, for the reasons indicated, milk has been the culprit in the minds of many people. We in the dairy industry should not try to get off the hook by implicating other foods, but we should have an understanding of the problem so we can defend our own product. Fallout such as strontium 90 falls to the ground and contaminates all material. It can be absorbed by growing plants and vegetables and be consumed in that manner or it can be eaten by the cow and transferred to milk and then consumed. Fallout such as iodine 131 falls to the ground and contaminates all material, is eaten by the cow and transferred to the milk. However, there are two reasons why iodine 131 presents a special problem for the fluid milk industry.

1. Milk makes up the major portion of the diet of infants, which are the most susceptible age group, and any iodine 131 in the diet of pregnant women or nursing mothers can also cause problems for the very young child.

2. Iodine 131 is present on the above-ground portion of any plants or vegetables, but, as there is usually considerable delay between harvest and consumption, the natural decay of radioactive iodine has greatly reduced the level.

It is because of these two facts that iodine 131 presents a more serious problem in milk than in other foods.

WHAT IS THE CURRENT FALLOUT PROBLEM?

Many of you are, no doubt, puzzled by the shift of emphasis from strontium 90 to iodine 131. This is not entirely a change because of the change in levels, but rather is brought about by a better understanding of the problem. Strontium levels have never been extremely high and are currently at levels that cause very little concern. Iodine 131 is much better understood now and is causing concern. I will try to briefly explain some facts about this problem. Radioactive iodine is a very short lived material. The total amount is reduced by half about every 8 days, so that after about 30 days following the test, there is very little radioactive material left.

Because the cow rapidly converts grass to milk and milk is consumed very soon after production, the material is transferred to the consumer before it has had time to decay. Whereas, in the case of meat, vegetables, grain, etc., this time before consumption is much longer. While iodine 131, as fallout, presents a problem that is essentially one for the milk industry, it also brings with it an encouraging fact that it makes it possible, because of its very short life, for the milk producer to make some contribution toward control in dairy products.

WHY IS IODINE 131 A PARTICULARLY SERIOUS PROBLEM?

Iodine is absorbed by the thyroid gland of humans and there is concern that excess levels of iodine 131 can cause damage to the very young thyroid gland. This means that it is important to young children and, when you consider the bulk of their diet comes from milk, there is good reason to be concerned. As a general rule, the only segment of the population that needs to be concerned are children under 1 year of age, pregnant women, and nursing mothers, as the thyroid gland of people over 1 year of age is less sensitive to damage. While this segment of the population makes up less than 5 percent of the total, we must remember that all people are not going to consider the facts: It is only natural for the mother to feel that milk unsuitable for her 1-year-old is also unsuitable for her other children so it would seem necessary to have a total milk supply that is relatively free of iodine 131 in order to make a major contribution to the reduction of fear from this source and protect your fluid milk market.

WHAT ARE SOME POSSIBLE CONTROL MEASURES?

Since the middle of June, your staff has had many meetings with other producer groups, milk dealers, local and State regulatory people, and the U.S. Public Health Service and others in Washington, to discuss and evaluate all possible control measures. There are several methods available, none of which are completely satisfactory and some of which would be extremely unsatisfactory.

1. Suspension of bomb testing or a change in time of testing. This is, of course, a political issue and involves national security and is beyond the control of the dairy industry. The timing of testing could be controlled in this country so that if it took place in the winter iodine 131 would have all disappeared before it could get onto pastures; however, we have no control over the testing by other nations so this method would seem to be of little value in our current or future problems.

2. Aging of milk prior to sale or consumption is another possible way of control, as this would provide time for the decay of iodine 131 before it was consumed. If milk could be held for 8 days after production, the radioactive level would be reduced by half. Think of your own situation. Could you store milk so you would always have 8-day-

old milk to drink? It would be very difficult. The problem would be even more difficult for a dairy, as necessary storage capacity would be tremendous. As there are serious objections to the production of a special milk for this susceptible group of individuals, it would seem impractical to rely on this method.

3. It has been suggested it would be possible to bring in supplies to a contaminated area from one with lower levels of contamination. The methods of daily evaluation to determine if the supply is safe are not available. An area that is clear today may be contaminated tomorrow, so problems of supply management would make this method very impractical and offer very little positive control. This is not just a problem and could occur anywhere in the Nation at any time.

4. Use of evaporated milk, sterile milk, or reconstituted dry milk has been most often mentioned, as this milk has been stored for a long period of time and the presence of iodine 131 would have dissipated during this period. This is the procedure being followed and advocated by those groups who are panicking and not studying the facts. Such a change in the wholesale milk consumption of our Nation would wreck the fluid milk market and would eventually be disastrous to the industry and the nutritional health of the consumer.

5. Controlled feeding of milking animals to insure that they do not eat contaminated feed seems to offer the best solution. Other markets throughout the Nation have also arrived at this same conclusion. We are well aware that this addition to our milk supply is through no fault of the producer and to place the burden on him at first seems unfair. Testing of bombs is being done for the general national security and, of course, when changes are made, some people suffer—often unfairly. As an example, when tractors took over on farms, the horse breeders and the harnessmakers suffered, but no one seriously suggested that we not use tractors. However, in this situation, it is reasonable to assume that the consumer will be asked to share some of the additional costs, but it is up to the producer to do everything possible to protect his market as the first requirement in this step that is so vital.

HOW DOES CONTROLLED FEEDING HELP?

Remember two facts previously presented: (1) Fallout settles on the forage, is consumed by the cow, and passes into the milk; (2) Iodine 131 dissipates in about 30 days. If an emergency situation should develop, it would be possible to substantially reduce iodine 131 in our milk by removing cows from fresh forage and feeding them grain and roughage that has been harvested and stored in piles or under cover for at least 3 weeks. This would be feed on which iodine 131 present would have already decayed, so very little would be able to pass through the animal into the milk supply.

OUTLINE OF PROCEDURE

After discussion with many groups of producers, regulatory officials, and others, the following procedure has been suggested for a uniform, statewide program to insure a milk supply with a low level of iodine 131 if and when an alert situation should develop. Such a program will enable producers for the first time to have a concrete answer to adverse publicity. Scare tactics can be answered with the information that producers are prepared to provide a wholesome milk supply if an emergency arises.

1. When the U.S. Public Health Service or authorized agency announces that this area is in the danger zone and emergency measures are needed, producers should be ready to implement the plan of aged feeding rapidly. Some advance warning should be possible—this might be only 4 or 5 days.

2. We will immediately mail affidavits to all grade A producers and advise them of the estimated premium they would receive for milk from aged feed. Each producer would have the opportunity to sign that he would produce all his milk from aged feed within 5 days from the date of the affidavit. Affidavits are to be returned within 5 days.

3. The producer organization would immediately evaluate the number of returned affidavits to estimate the percent of compliance and the approximate effect this effect would have on the radioactive iodine level.

4. Public Health Service would continue to advise the producer groups of testing results and notify them when they felt the alert period had expired.

5. The percent of affidavits returned would furnish a guide or information which might be helpful in determining whether or not it might become necessary to either establish a higher premium or segregate milk at pickup.

6. Health department personnel, fieldmen, and others would be expected to report any violations, and so forth.

I have attempted to give you a brief outline of the problem the industry faces and a possible solution. We would like to emphasize that there is no need to panic. We are constantly being advised by our State board of health and the U.S. Public Health Service of the situation and we will be alerted in time to implement the plan. We feel it is important that you all know the situation and are familiar with the subject. It is much easier to do this at a time when we are not under pressure than it would be in a time of emergency. I am sure there are many questions left unanswered so let's have plenty of discussion so we can all become familiar with the problem that could adversely affect our business, if not properly controlled.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this amendment would authorize the Secretary to make feed owned by CCC available to producers of milk when necessary to assure a supply of milk free of radioactive fallout contamination. Feed might be made available at such prices and on such terms and conditions as determined appropriate in the public interest.

This amendment would permit supplementing supplies of stored feed available commercially when countermeasures against radioactive fallout require taking cattle off of pasture and other contaminated fresh feed.

At present there is no apparent shortage of stored feeds. Hay supplies in areas most likely to be affected by fallout are above normal and high levels of grain and concentrate feed are, or will shortly be, in effect for the winter months in these areas. The Department is studying the situation and will make such recommendation, as early as possible, as it feels is required under the circumstances.

Mr. President, I have discussed the amendment with my good friend from Wisconsin. I am willing to take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, for himself and the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. McCARTHY], who is unavoidably absent because of an

operation on his young daughter, and for myself I call up the amendment identified as "8-16-62-A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 91, between lines 7 and 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

SUBTITLE C—DAIRY

Sec. 326. The current rate of production and marketing of milk in the continental United States, excluding Alaska, is such as will result in excessive and burdensome supplies of milk and other dairy products during the period ending March 31, 1964.

In order to afford producers the opportunity and the means by which they can on a compensated basis voluntarily adjust their marketings of milk during the period ending March 31, 1964, more nearly to equal demand and thus reduce Government purchases under its price support program, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, to carry out for the period ending March 31, 1964, an emergency dairy surplus reduction payments program as set forth in the following sections of this subtitle.

Sec. 327. The Commodity Credit Corporation is hereby authorized to make surplus reduction payments to producers in continental United States, excluding Alaska, who agree to reduce, during any one or more quarterly marketing periods, starting on or after October 1, 1962, and ending March 31, 1964, their marketings to a level not (i) less than 10 per centum or (ii) more than the larger of 25 per centum or fifteen thousand pounds of milk below their normal marketing levels established pursuant to section 328 of this Act of each such quarterly marketing period. Such payments shall not exceed (i) \$2.50 per hundredweight of milk, basis 3.82 per centum butterfat content, (ii) such rates as the Secretary determines will effectuate voluntary reduction in marketings by producers, or (iii) the cost of acquiring such milk in the form of dairy products had such milk been marketed. A producer who fails to reduce his marketings to the extent required by his agreement shall be eligible to the surplus reduction payment on the quantity by which he actually reduced his marketings below his normal marketing level, provided he reduces by as much as 10 per centum of his normal marketing level, but the amount of such payment shall be reduced by an amount equal to 20 per centum of what would have been the payment on the quantity of milk which he failed to reduce. Agreements entered into hereunder may contain such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines necessary to effectuate the purposes of the emergency dairy surplus reduction payments program and to assure that a producer's reduction in marketings is not offset through a transfer of his milk cows to another producer for the production and marketing of milk.

Sec. 328. The Secretary shall establish a normal marketing level for each producer in the continental United States, excluding Alaska, who desires to enter into an agreement with Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to section 327 of this Act. Such normal marketing level shall be the number of pounds of milk, or the number of pounds of milkfat, or such units of dairy products as the Secretary may deem appropriate for the administration of this subtitle which is the lower of (i) the producer's marketings during the marketing year ending March 31, 1962, or (ii) the Secretary's estimate of what would be marketed in a marketing year by the producer based on the rate of his marketings when he enters into the agreement with Commodity Credit Corporation, adjusted for seasonal variation. In establish-

ing a normal marketing level, the Secretary shall make such adjustments in the producer's 1961-62 marketings as he deems necessary for flood, drought, disease of herd, personal health, or other abnormal conditions affecting production or marketing, including the fact that the producer may have commenced production and marketing after April 1, 1961. A producer's normal marketing level for the marketing year shall be apportioned by the Secretary among quarterly marketing periods thereof in accordance with the producer's prior marketing pattern, subject to such adjustments as the Secretary determines necessary to enable the producer to carry out his herd management plans for the marketing year. The quantity thus apportioned to a quarterly marketing period shall be the producer's normal marketing level for such period.

Sec. 329. The Secretary shall prescribe such conversion factors as he deems necessary for use in determining the quantity of milk marketed by producers who market their milk in the form of farm-separated cream, butterfat, and other dairy products.

Sec. 330. The quantity of milk reduced by a producer pursuant to his agreement under this Act shall be considered as having been produced and marketed by him for the purpose of determining his production or marketing history under any farm program in which such history may become a factor. A producer who moves from one area to another and there engages in the production and marketing of milk may take with him all or any portion of his normal marketing level.

Sec. 331. The Commodity Credit Corporation may make supplemental payments to producers of milk for manufacturing who enter into agreements under section 327, which shall be in addition to the surplus reduction payments made to such producers. The amount of such a supplemental payment to be made with respect to the quantity of milk marketed by a producer may not exceed the difference between the United States average price at wholesale of milk for manufacturing and 90 per centum of the parity price for that quantity of such milk.

Sec. 332. (a) The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as are necessary for the enforcement and the effective administration of this subtitle.

(b) Costs incurred in the carrying out of the provisions of this subtitle shall be borne by the Commodity Credit Corporation and shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses of the Corporation.

Sec. 333. Whenever normal marketing levels are established under this subtitle, notwithstanding any provision of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 (7 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), any order issued under section 8c thereof shall in addition to the provisions in section 8c (5) and (7) contain provisions for an adjustment in the uniform price for producers receiving surplus reduction payments for marketings below their normal marketing level. Under such provisions the total payments to such producers under an order shall be equal to (1) the uniform price multiplied by their normal marketing level minus (2) the lowest class price under the order multiplied by the amount by which such producers have reduced marketings below their normal marketing level. In the computation of the uniform price there shall be included, at the lowest class price, the volume of milk upon which producers will be entitled to surplus reduction payments. For the purposes of this section a producer's normal marketing level shall be apportioned on a monthly basis. In the case of a producer, part of whose normal marketing level is based on marketings which were not subject to regulation under the order during the representative period, the Secretary shall apportion such producer's normal marketing

level in accordance with his deliveries of milk in such representative period and the reduction in deliveries from the amount apportioned to the marketing area shall be considered in the calculation of the uniform price and payment under such order. The incorporation of provisions in an order hereunder shall be subject to the same procedural requirements of the Act as other provisions under section 8c.

SEC. 334. No person engaged in the purchase or handling of milk, milk fat, or dairy products shall discriminate against any producer who enters into an agreement with the Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to this Act. The Commodity Credit Corporation shall not purchase dairy products from any person whom the Secretary determines practices such discrimination. The several district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction to hear and determine controversies arising under this section, without regard to the amount in controversy, and to enjoin and restrain any person or persons from discriminating or conspiring to discriminate against any producer in violation of this section.

SEC. 335. (a) Notwithstanding section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, the Secretary may, in carrying out the emergency dairy program authorized in this subtitle, establish price supports for milk and butterfat at such level between 70 and 75 per centum of the parity price therefor as he deems appropriate.

(b) The authority granted by the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall become effective on April 1, 1963.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my colleague, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], is the main sponsor of the amendment, and I am a cosponsor.

Mr. President, this amendment would add a dairy program to the Senate bill. It is an emergency measure and it would be in force for 18 months, starting October 1.

I believe Senate approval of a dairy program this year is of utmost importance to the welfare of the dairy farmers of the Nation, as well as a responsible action to reduce the excessive Government-held surpluses of dairy products and the extremely high Government costs under the existing program.

I do not believe anyone disputes the seriousness of the dairy situation. Dairy farmers are greatly concerned and representatives of the major dairy producer groups are apprehensive. I regret these representatives have not been able to agree on recommendations for a program, but at the same time I do not believe the Congress is relieved of the responsibility to act on an emergency program because producer groups are unable to agree. We have an opportunity at this time to take a constructive step to reduce Government costs, to improve dairy income, and to prevent accumulation of Government-held surpluses.

A well-balanced dairy industry is of direct value to everyone in the Nation. Milk is used in every home and it is of particular importance for the health of children. Milk is produced in every State of the Nation.

Yet the distress of this industry is reaching emergency proportions. In his letter of last week to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], Secretary Freeman stated:

The dairy price support program is now reaching an extremely critical situation.

The Secretary was specific about the need for action. He wrote in the same letter:

In my opinion there is an urgent and immediate need for legislative action in order to prevent a debacle with the most serious consequences for dairy farmers, consumers, and taxpayers.

The fact is that the existing dairy legislation, regardless of its merits in the past, is not accomplishing its purpose under present law, milk and dairy products are supported at a minimum of 75 percent of parity, and the Commodity Credit Corporation is obligated to make purchases necessary to maintain that level. Yet dairy income will be down from \$250 million to \$300 million this year—reflecting the obligatory cut in price supports of last April 1 from 82 to 75 percent of parity. Yet the net cost of the dairy price support operation for the last marketing year totaled \$597 million, and the Department has estimated that the cost for this year will be \$550 million. The Commodity Credit Corporation is purchasing dairy products for price support purposes at the equivalent of an annual rate of 10.5 billion pounds of the annual marketings of 119.3 billion pounds—which means the equivalent of about 10 percent of the marketings of milk.

The cost of the dairy program has reached an alltime high. Secretary Freeman stated in his letter of August 15 to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]:

These Government expenditures amount to 50 cents for each 100 pounds of milk marketed by U.S. dairy farmers during 1961-62. * * * The cost of price support operations for the amount of milk produced during the year by an average dairy cow comes to \$36; the cost for a herd of 30 average milk cows for the year was \$1,080.

It is expected that the CCC will have to acquire 400 million pounds of butter, 250 million pounds of cheese, and 1.2 billion pounds of dried milk this year.

The storage of butter has already nearly reached capacity, and Secretary Freeman states:

Because space is not available locally, we are already required to ship butter from Minneapolis to the South for storage, necessitating extra transportation costs of 1 to 4 cents per pound before its ultimate disposition will be possible. * * * We are face to face with the prospect within a few months of having no place to put butter acquired through price-support purchases.

The dairy farmers of the Nation have been severely criticized for not cutting down on production and for not initiating a self-help program. But in the practical operations of the farm market, can we censure the individual farmer for the fact of excess production? Can we with justice chastise and threaten him because of surpluses? The last census showed that there were more than 800,000 farms in the Nation that reported sales of whole milk, and more than 250,000 farms reported sales of cream. If the individual farmer determines to cut back 10 percent of his marketings, does he have any guarantee that total production will drop? Does he have any

guarantee that his neighbors will likewise reduce their production? From his viewpoint, the only certain thing is that his income will drop.

As Secretary Freeman stated:

Individual dairy farmers are continuing to improve their efficiency and increase production at a rapid rate. At present milk prices, this is the only means the individual dairy farmer has of maintaining his gross income in the face of continually increasing production costs.

I do not believe we should be too hard on the individual dairy farmer for failing to reduce production. I think we must admit present law does not really contain any procedure by which dairy farmers can carry out an effective reduction program. My discussions with dairy farmers and dairy industry leaders indicate that, on the whole, they would welcome a procedure by which they could make adjustments, but they are fearful of any change in the present law unless the method of adjustment provides safeguards to maintain their already low income.

Our amendment provides a procedure for a fair and reasonable adjustment. It is a voluntary program. It does not impose any mandatory quotas and it does not require a referendum. It is not offered as a final or permanent solution, but as an emergency measure to be effective over the next year and a half. It is designed to increase the net income of the average cooperator and to cut down on Government costs and Government-held surpluses. It would provide valuable experience and a basis for effective permanent legislation.

The bill approved by the House of Representatives, H.R. 12391, contains a dairy program to encourage milk producers to make voluntary reductions in their marketings. Under the House bill producers would be paid up to \$2.50 per hundred for reduction of from 10 to 25 percent of their average marketing for 1961.

The House program is a minimum approach, but it does not offer much prospect of reducing the surplus to a significant degree or of improving the income of dairy farmers.

Our amendment generally incorporates the House provisions. It would provide for surplus reduction payments to producers of up to \$2.50 per hundred on the quantity by which they reduce their production. It also would permit producers in Federal order markets to make adjustments in their marketings at the surplus price rather than at the blend price and thus would safeguard their share of the class I market.

The important addition of our amendment is the provision to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to make supplemental payments to cooperating producers of milk in addition to the surplus reduction payments. The amount of the supplemental payment would be set by the Secretary at a rate not to exceed the difference between the U.S. average price at wholesale of milk for manufacturing purposes and 90 percent of parity for that quantity.

The Secretary would also be permitted to set the general minimum support price at between 70 and 75 percent of parity, but this authority would not be effective until after the end of the current marketing year, March 31, 1963. This authority would not replace the existing law but simply would provide for a temporary exception when the emergency program is in operation.

Our amendment is based upon the same procedure employed in the emergency feed grain program of the past 2 years. The surplus reduction payments of milk are to be the equivalent to the payments on acreage diverted from feed grain production. The supplemental payments on the milk marketed by those choosing to enter the reduction program are to be equivalent to the difference between the support price offered feed grain producers and the market level at which those who do not enter the program sell their feed grains.

In the dairy program it is not possible to maintain different prices in precisely the same manner as in the feed grain program because the loans or purchases used in the feed grain program cannot be extended to individual producers on their milk. The effect of the supplemental payments, however, is the same: the supplemental payments made to cooperating milk producers would reflect the difference between the market price and the support level set by the Secretary—up to 90 percent of parity—for those cooperating in the program.

It is estimated the program provided by our amendment would accomplish a fairly substantial reduction in dairy price support expenditures by the Government. The savings over the existing program would be achieved because it is cheaper to make a surplus reduction payment of \$2.50 or less to the producer for not producing a hundred pounds of milk than for the CCC to pay over \$4 for the milk after it is produced and processed. The economy of this procedure is estimated to be great enough to permit making the supplemental payments to cooperating producers and still realize a savings in total costs over the existing program.

The individual producers who choose to enter the program would benefit from the payments and they would receive an effective higher support level and higher income than they are receiving under the present program. Producers who do not wish to participate would be free to produce as they desire at the market price.

The House bill recognizes the problem. It does not have the potential for securing a substantial participation by dairy farmers. It is clear the temporary feed grain program would not have been as effective if payments had been made to farmers only for diverted acres. The feed grain program provides also for a higher support price on the amount the cooperator markets. The same procedure is needed for an effective dairy program. The amendment which I am offering for myself and my colleague, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], would give the Secretary of Agriculture authority, to be used

at his discretion, to improve the income of dairy farmers and to meet the problem of dairy surpluses and costs over the next 18 months.

In summary, the amendment would provide:

First. A voluntary, emergency program; no mandatory quotas and no producer referendum.

Second. Effective for 18 months, October 1, 1962, to March 31, 1964.

Third. Surplus reduction payments for those producers who choose to participate; payments of up to \$2.50 per hundredweight on amount of average marketing reduced, between 10 and 25 percent based on normal marketings for the 1961-62 marketing year—March 31, 1961, to March 31, 1962.

Fourth. Supplemental payments to those participating; paid on quantity they market at a rate not to exceed the difference between the U.S. average price at wholesale of milk for manufacturing and 90 percent of parity for that quantity of such milk.

Fifth. Authority for the Secretary to adjust the general basic price support for milk between 70 and 75 percent of parity, dependent upon supplies; effective April 1, 1963, and only for purposes of carrying out the emergency dairy program authorized by the act.

Mr. President, my colleague and I have prepared a table as an example of what would happen under the terms of the proposal. It would, in essence, reduce the cost to the Government, on the basis of an estimate of the Department of Agriculture, for the coming year. There would be approximately a \$110 million reduction in the cost of the dairy program.

Our proposal would increase the net income of farm producers more than \$150 for an average producer who markets a thousand hundredweight of milk. It would also reduce the cost to the farm producer by the elimination of certain feed costs, thereby increasing total net income substantially.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table to which I have referred printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Payment program with market price at \$2.90 (70 percent of parity), 1963-64 marketing year

PROGRAM EXPENDITURES	
Current projection of marketing (billion pounds) ..	120.0
Estimated commercial market at \$2.70 (billion pounds) ..	110.5
Needed adjustment ¹ (billion pounds) ..	9.5
Surplus reduction payments on 95 million hundredweights at \$1.90 per hundredweight ² ..	\$180,000,000

¹ Assumed about 70 percent of producers reducing 10 percent, or 35 percent reducing 20 percent.

² Surplus reduction payment rate set at \$1 less than market price.

Payment program with market price at \$2.90 (70 percent of parity), 1963-64 marketing year—Continued

PROGRAM EXPENDITURES—Continued	
Supplemental payments on 547 million hundredweights of cooperator milk at 40 cents per hundredweight ³ ..	\$219,000,000
Purchases of 600 million pounds NFIM ⁴ ..	90,000,000
Total program expenditure ..	489,000,000

EFFECT ON A COOPERATING PRODUCER	
Present gross from 1,000 hundredweights of milk ..	3,110
Under McCarthy-Humphrey program:	
Market return on 900 hundredweights ..	2,610
Surplus reduction payments ..	190
Supplemental payment ..	360
Gross from 900 hundredweights ..	3,160

³ Supplemental payment rate set at level adequate to make gross income of cooperator slightly higher than at 75 percent of parity under present program. Also assumes 50 percent of cooperators are Federal order producers receiving payment on 28 percent of milk marketed.

⁴ Purchases of NFIM equal to quantity by which present percent surplus of nonfat milk solids exceeds present percentage surplus of milk fat.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am hopeful the Senate will see fit to send to conference, for purposes of whatever refinement may be permitted there, a dairy program which would do something, first, about the growth of the accumulation in Government hands of dairy products, which is a very serious matter. Second, the sharp drop in dairy income. Dairy farmers are among the hardest working farmers we have. They have high costs of operation and maintenance. Third, the program would reduce the cost to the taxpayers, according to the Department of Agriculture's own estimates, by \$110 million in 1 year, which is no small amount of money in any program or in any bill.

I would appreciate the comments of the chairman on the subject, because I feel the proposal merits support.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I regret to say that I do not favor the amendment. As I stated yesterday and last Friday, the milk program deserves a great deal of study. In order to attain that goal, I introduced a bill which would serve as a vehicle for the holding of hearings during the recess and early next year in the hope that we can get a dairy bill together.

As the Senator is aware, an almost identical amendment was offered to the Senate in May when we considered S. 3225. At that time I objected to the amendment, and the Senate voted it down. I hope the Senate will take the same steps this time so that we can go along with the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I understand, the House bill does contain a dairy section.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that it does.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is my sincere hope that the measure which has been developed by my distinguished colleague [Mr. McCARTHY]—and I pay particular respect to him for the work he has put into this proposal—it is my hope that in conference the main features of the amendment will be incorporated. It is my hope the Senate will vote favorably upon the amendment. I make that statement because it offers at least some temporary relief. It offers the relief on a tried and tested principle of what we call surplus reduction payments, along the lines that have been incorporated in the emergency feed grain program. It also provides for supplemental payments on the amount the producer markets, so that, for example, the net income of the farm producer, by producing 100 hundredweights less of milk, would be higher than if he produced his full amount.

In other words, the farm producer who would produce 1,000 hundredweights of milk would actually receive less money than if he participated in the program and produced 900 hundredweights of milk. This is the kind of program, it seems to me, which would provide some relief for the farm producer. It would provide tax relief for the taxpayer, and provide some relief for the Government of the United States in the accumulation of surpluses.

I am hopeful we can have favorable action on the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The proposal was brought before the committee. The committee rejected it both last April, as I recall, and again this time.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point an explanation of the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This amendment is somewhat similar to the dairy diversion provision of the bill as passed by the House, but provides in addition for production payments to participating producers.

This amendment provides for a diversion program during the period October 1, 1962, through March 31, 1964, under which the Commodity Credit Corporation could (1) make payments not exceeding \$2.50 per hundredweight to producers agreeing to reduce their milk marketings below their adjusted marketings for the 1961-62 marketing year, and (2) make supplemental payments to such producers in amounts not exceeding the difference between the U.S. average wholesale price and 90 percent of parity.

Effective April 1, 1963, the range of price support levels for milk and butterfat would be reduced to 70 to 75 percent of parity.

To participate in the program a producer would have to reduce his marketings at least 10 percent and could obtain payments for a reduction of up to the larger of 25 percent, or 15,000 pounds per quarter. If the producer failed to reduce as much as he had agreed to do, but reduced at least 10 percent, he would be eligible for payments for the amount of the actual reduction, reduced by 20 percent of what would have been

the payment on the quantity he failed to reduce.

In any marketing order area, payments from the pool would be adjusted so that the amounts paid participating producers would be reduced by reason of their reduced marketings only by the lowest class price multiplied by the reduction.

Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Agriculture studied a number of dairy programs during the course of its hearings on, and consideration of, S. 2786. Some of the programs studied were mandatory, while others were voluntary and somewhat along the lines of the pending amendment. There was a great deal of opposition to them. The mandatory programs were opposed as too restrictive. The voluntary programs were felt to be ineffective and too costly. At the time that S. 3225 was before the Senate, the Senate considered and rejected by a vote of 60 to 21 an amendment by the Senator from Wisconsin generally similar to the amendment now proposed by him.

The dairy situation is a very serious one, as indicated by the letter I recently received from the Secretary of Agriculture and inserted in the RECORD of August 16. I think the committee should hold further hearings to explore fully any new proposals or suggestions that can be developed.

I do not believe a satisfactory solution can be worked out at this moment. While the pending amendment contains some hopeful language with respect to assuring that reductions by one producer are not offset through the transfer of his cows to another producer, the mechanics for providing such assurance are not developed. It is a very complex problem.

As I pointed out when the similar amendment to S. 3225 was rejected by the Senate, I doubt that the farmers would feed their cows less, in order to reduce production. They would dispose of some of their cows, while other producers might increase their herds, possibly by acquisition of the same cows.

The average production of a cow in the United States, as I recall, is approximately 7,000 pounds of milk; and a farmer who had a cow which was producing 7,000 pounds of milk could dispose of the cow, and could obtain from the Government \$175, in payments, at \$2.50 a hundred; and the cow could find its way to another producer who could obtain from the Government \$217.70 for producing milk—assuming that the cow would then produce the same amount that it did when it was owned by the other farmer.

On the other hand, the amendment contains a provision for the making of additional payments to farmers who would make this cut. In other words, such a farmer would be paid at the rate of \$2.50 per hundred pounds, for every 100 pounds he reduced his production; but for the rest of his production, the Secretary of Agriculture would be empowered, under this amendment, to raise the price—the price on the rest of the farmer's milk production—or to give him compensatory payments, which could go up from \$3.11 to \$3.70 a hundred pounds.

So, Mr. President, I cannot understand how the Government would gain by this amendment; and in view of the fact that the program would be a voluntary one, and there would be no method by which farmers could be prevented from selling their cows or from making their cows produce less, I doubt that the program would have the benefits intended by the Senator from Minnesota.

So, Mr. President, I shall ask Senators to vote against this amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The proposal of the Senator from Minnesota makes a great

deal of sense. Very simply, what it would do would be to permit the farmer to get as much as \$2.50 per hundredweight for the milk which he does not produce. It makes sense for the reason that if the farmer does produce the milk, the Federal Government must pay \$4.50 for it. Therefore the Government would save \$2 for every hundredweight. In many cases the dairy farmer would be better off. He would reduce his production. Storage costs would be cut. The program adds up and makes a great deal of sense.

I understand that there is a chance, at least, that the amendment will not be accepted. It may not be agreed to. But the House measure contains that kind of provision, as I understand. I join the Senator from Minnesota in urging and pleading with the chairman to give real consideration to the amendment in conference. I hope and pray that he will at least give dairy farmers an opportunity to try that program for a few months. I think that, according to the House bill, the program would continue to June 1. Let us see if that kind of program would work. If it should work, it would cut Government costs and increase farm income.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I merely wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that this is not a local matter of interest in his State and the adjoining State of the Senator from Wisconsin. The dairy farmers of my State have informed me that about 90 percent of the dairy farmers in my State favor the proposed method of attempting to solve some of their difficult problems, and at the same time, as the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, it would reduce the cost to the Government of this very program. I join in recommending that they be given an opportunity to see whether they can better themselves. At the same time the cost to the Government of the program would be reduced in the manner advocated by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HART. I congratulate both the distinguished Senators from Minnesota for developing the proposal that the Senate is now considering, and to express the hope, as they and other Senators have done, that the committee will be able to hear from those most directly concerned—the milk producers—some measure of agreement when the hearings are held.

Michigan has produced not only much milk of high quality but a very able leader in the dairy industry in America. Not only is he president of the Michigan Milk Producers Association but also he is president of the National Milk Producers Federation. I speak of Glenn Lake. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial written by Glenn Lake in the Michigan Milk Producers Messenger entitled "We're Riding a Tiger" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE'RE RIDING A TIGER
(By Glenn Lake)

The cost of the dairy price support program to date has not been very great—averaging about \$238 million every year for the past 10 years. That's a lot of money but it's far less proportionately than has been spent to support prices of other agricultural products.

If present milk production continues though, and no new ways are found to dispose of dairy products, Commodity Credit Corporation will have to lay out better than \$600 million this year to support milk prices. That kind of money—twice what the White House says can be justified for a dairy program—is certain to arouse the public and Congress.

The Government may have 500 million pounds of butter and a billion pounds of powder on hand by the end of this marketing year. It looks now as if 10 to 12 percent of our 1962 milk output will have to be marketed through Government programs.

Some Congressmen are already saying that this tremendous buildup of surplus dairy products will almost certainly result in the loss of present guaranteed minimum supports at 75 percent of parity. Others believe dairy farmers have a better deal than the rest of agriculture and should accept lower supports (65 percent of parity has been suggested), or production controls, to reduce the cost of the dairy program.

A PERILOUS RIDE

We may argue against production controls and insist that present support levels are vitally necessary, but it is apparent we are weakening ourselves economically, politically, and institutionally by our own production efficiency. Nor can we argue with the fact that continuation of present production, without a corresponding increase in sales, is bound to result in lower prices regardless of what the Government does.

In a sense we are riding a tiger and dare not get off. Dairy farmers are forced to increase production to meet rising costs. Yet this increased output continually drives our prices down, forcing even greater expansion. We must ask ourselves if we are to continue this perilous ride or if there is a course of action that makes more economic sense.

While I do not think we should grasp at just any program in the belief that anything is better than what we now have, I do believe that dairy farmers must make a choice and must recognize that there is no course of action open to us which offers a simple or painless solution.

THREE CHOICES

In my opinion our choices have been narrowed down to three categories: (1) The economic application of price—let supply and demand correct the situation; (2) self-imposed restraint or reduction of output through cooperatives; (3) Government programs.

If we choose the supply-demand route, that is, no program of any kind—we must be ready to take an 80 cents to \$1 cut in milk prices. That would probably balance supply and demand after awhile, but for the short run at least, such a program would border on economic suicide for dairy farmers, forcing many out of business.

Production control programs administered through co-ops are voluntary by nature. Their practicality might be questioned since they would place a premium on being a non-member. Producers could escape controls simply by becoming nonmembers.

Properly enforced Government production controls as proposed in recent months could undoubtedly balance supply with demand. But if such programs were to sustain or im-

prove net farm income, they must be accompanied by an increase in the price of milk. Such an increase has not been proposed or assured in any legislation thus far advanced.

CAN'T HAVE EVERYTHING

No matter what kind of program we might eventually have, we cannot have lower food costs to the consumer, lower Government costs, and better farm income all at the same time. Legislation suggested up to this point has emphasized the first two of these points, but has not provided for any improvement in dairy farmers' net income.

Regardless of how we may feel about the present unpleasant situation or the choices open to us, we cannot close our eyes and hope the problem will go away. It won't.

The administration's farm policies are aimed at controlling production and cutting costs of the dairy program in one way or another. We would be naive to think we are not going to have more Government in the dairy industry. It is up to us to see that we have the kind of program that is sound and will benefit our industry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, unlike the Senator from Louisiana, I can oppose the amendment offered by my esteemed colleague from Minnesota without particular regret. I do not think it is a good amendment. In fact, I do not think it would be a good idea to pay farmers \$2.50 a hundred for not producing milk from October 1 until next spring, which is through the short season, and at the same time permit them to sell or lease their cows to one of their neighbors or relatives, who would get paid for milking them.

Mr. President, I should like to take about 2 minutes to put in the RECORD a few facts as to what has been transpiring in the dairy industry during the last 18 months. On April 1, 1961, the Commodity Credit Corporation owned no butter whatsoever. On August 17, 1962, the Commodity Credit Corporation owned 356,241,900 pounds of butter.

On April 1, 1961, the Commodity Credit Corporation owned no cheese whatever. On August 17, 1962, the Commodity Credit Corporation owned 106,796,800 pounds of cheese.

Since Congress last spring killed the administration's program for controlling the dairy industry, the production of milk has dropped below last year for two successive months, and continues to drop. The consumption of fluid milk has increased materially above last year. Prices for milk, except for manufacturing purposes, have sharply increased in many areas; not in all, but in many.

Commodity Credit Corporation purchases of butter and cheese have dropped below last year during 5 of the last 6 weeks.

The Secretary submits figures to the public to show that purchases of butter and cheese are greater this year than they were in 1961. We must remember, however, that the Secretary did not get a chance to start the New Frontier program for milk until April 1961, and that there were 3 months of 1961 when there were no purchases made whatever. So when the Secretary says that we have bought more butter and cheese this year than we did in the first 7 months of last year, he is entirely correct, but he forgets to inform the public that he includes

3 months of last year when there were no purchases under the previous program.

The butter market has been injured. There is no question about that fact. It happened for different reasons. The consumption of butter has dropped. There is one particular reason for that fact. On June 15, 1961, the farmers were receiving \$2.60 a bushel for soybeans, and there was no excess of soybeans in the country. In the spring of 1961, the Secretary asked farmers to increase their planting of soybeans heavily, and to make sure that they did he raised support prices for 1961 from \$1.86 a bushel to \$2.30 a bushel. They planted in accordance with that request. They planted so much that the soybean crop last year hit almost 700 million bushels, by far the greatest production in this country. This year they will produce more. The price to farmers in 1961 for soybeans was \$2.60 a bushel. It has dropped this year to \$2.34 a bushel. The worst of it is that the price of soybean oil has gone straight down until yesterday it was only 8½ cents a pound; 8-cent oil knocks the props from under 58-cent butter. That is one thing that is happening to our butter market, although, as I have said, the Government presently is not buying as much butter as it was a year ago.

To offset the low prices of soybean oil, the processors in the last 2 years have raised the price of soybean meal 40 percent. That is where the cattle feeders come into the picture. The livestock growers are being asked to pay the cost of the folly of the Secretary of Agriculture last year by encouraging people to go into soybeans over their necks.

The pending amendment should not be adopted. The chairman has stated that he will hold hearings on the dairy situation. The dairy situation is improving, although I am willing to admit that there is a peculiar problem in those areas where purchases of manufacturing milk only are made. I hope that in the course of the hearings we may find out what ought to be done about it. For those reasons I must oppose the amendment offered by my friend, the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota a few questions. On the last page of the amendment reference is made to support prices. Do I understand that these support prices would be paid to all dairy farmers, both those who go into the voluntary program and those who do not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The present law requires that all producers are eligible for the 75-percent support prices. The amendment would reduce the 75 percent to 70 percent. Those who participated in the program and voluntarily cut back would get what we call surplus supplemental payments. They would be the only ones that would get it.

Mr. MILLER. The support prices would be the same for both groups?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Just as it is under present law. Our amendment reduces

the support price from 75 percent to 70 percent for all participants. This would include nonparticipants as well as those in the program.

Mr. MILLER. The point I wanted to bring out was that although the provisions of the amendment are referred to as being similar to the emergency feed grains program, it seems to me there is a substantial difference with respect to support prices, because under the emergency feed grains program, the one who goes into the production program is guaranteed a higher support price than the one who does not, whereas under the pending amendment they are both treated the same.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator would read the whole amendment he would find that those who go into the program, while they would get the same support price level, would also get an additional support level, so that their net income would be brought up considerably.

Mr. MILLER. Is the additional support to which the Senator has referred covered by section 331 on page 5?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is covered by section 327 on page 2, and also by section 328 on page 3, which relates to the so-called normal marketing level, and it is also covered by section 331.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senators from Minnesota, to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier we discussed the possibility of a final vote on the bill tomorrow. I now propound a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the requirement for a quorum call under rule XII before submitting an agreement to vote on final passage of the bill at a specified time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on final passage of H.R. 12391 at 2 p.m. tomorrow, and that the time on the bill be equally divided between the majority leader and the minority leader after the conclusion of the morning business until 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What time does the Senator contemplate that the Senate will convene?

Mr. HUMPHREY. At 11 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That the Senate vote at 2 p.m., on Wednesday, August 22, 1962, on final passage of H.R. 12391, to improve and protect farm income, to reduce costs of farm programs to the Federal Government, to reduce the Federal Government's excessive stocks of agricultural commodities, to maintain reasonable and stable prices of agricultural commodities and products to consumers, to provide adequate supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic and foreign needs, to conserve natural resources, and for other purposes; *Provided*, That the time after the morning business be equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority leaders.

TEXAS, LARGEST FARM STATE, FAVORS FARM BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the State of Texas, which with 232,000 farms has more farms than any other State in the Nation, has a vital stake in the pending farm legislation.

In my opinion, we will be courting economic disaster for many of our farmers, should we fail to pass extended, new and improved legislation this year.

Failure to act will force us to continue under an unchanged and unsatisfactory program dating back to 1958.

Many areas of Texas are currently hard hit by extremely hot and dry weather. My home city of Austin had over 55 days without rain. If farm prices are permitted to fall to the level permitted by the 1958 program, untold hardships will be brought down on our farm population.

The impact of income losses in agriculture, added to the blows already dealt to national stability by an unstable economy and a high level of unemployment, is something that must be and can be avoided by this Congress.

The national economy has a stake in the farmer's plight. A downhill slide is hard to stop. The repeal of all farm support legislation would bankrupt American agriculture, and the drought-stricken areas will suffer first and most. Hundreds of thousands of farm families would be driven into the cities' breadlines if the farm price support programs were terminated.

Three of our major farm organizations, the National Farmers Union, the National Grange, and the National Association of Wheat Growers, are jointly working for enactment of a strong farm bill during this session of the Congress. They are for this bill.

It is true the wheat legislation being proposed may have been delayed too long by congressional inaction, but it is still a good program and should be passed.

The dairy farmers of Texas and throughout the United States need a program to stabilize their industry and I favor a voluntary program similar to last year's feed grain program now being proposed in an amendment by Senator McCARTHY. This amendment should also be included when we pass the farm bill.

Mr. President, I cannot overemphasize the importance of this body acting now to pass an effective farm bill. I am for H.R. 12391 and shall vote for its passage.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I indicated several weeks ago when the earlier agricultural legislation was under consideration by the Senate that I hoped that the Congress would move with a great deal of caution and that we not saddle farmers and ranchers with the so-called supply-management controls. A lot of water has gone over the dam since that time. The House in its wisdom has turned down the 1962 version of the Cochrane-Freeman supply-control scheme.

Again, I would suggest to my colleagues that we should move with a great deal of caution at this late date in dealing with this very important segment of our economy.

As I have indicated on previous occasions to the Senate, agriculture is one of the mainstays in the economy of the great State of Utah. The cash receipts from farm marketings last year amounted to an impressive \$156,193,000. About \$125 million of this income was from livestock and livestock products. The great bulk of our income from agriculture is from beef cattle, dairying, and production of lambs and wool.

The principal elements of the bill now under consideration deal with the two most vital segments of our agricultural economy; namely, livestock and livestock products, and wheat.

If I understand correctly, the administration has abandoned its supply-management, mandatory program for feed grains for 1963. I am happy that this decision has been made, because it is my opinion that the Congress is in no mood to inflict such drastic controls on the segment of the agricultural enterprise that accounts for about 56 percent of the total cash farm receipts.

If my information is correct, it seems to be the intention of the administration now to support a simple extension of the emergency feed grain program for 1963. This is the program that Mr. Freeman condemned so severely during the debate of this bill in the House.

One June 8, 1962, the Secretary of Agriculture sent a communication to every Member of the House wherein he pointed out on page 2 of a letter addressed to Congressman HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, that extension of the 1961-62 emergency programs would cost for feed grains \$1,200 million and for wheat \$1,217 million—a total of \$2,417 million. I am a little surprised that in light of this statement and in light of the recent talk about a balanced budget that the Secretary of Agriculture would now suggest that the Senate of the United States adopt such an expensive program.

With regard to the cost of the emergency wheat program, I remember well the statement made by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I quote:

To authorize the temporary program for 2 more years would cost the taxpayers, according to the most recent estimate \$333

million per year to reduce wheat production by about 100 million bushels. In other words, it would cost the Government \$3.30 per bushel to curtail production of 100 million bushels of wheat per year.

According to the Commodity Credit Corporation's latest information, payments to farmers under the 1962 feed grain program will be about \$114 million more than the \$896 million paid in 1961. I would point out to my colleagues that this is slightly over a billion dollars that would be paid out on the 1962 feed grain crops. But, in spite of this vast expenditure of money, as of August 1, 1962, the estimate of production of feed grains is 139,506,000 tons as compared to 131,132,000 tons for the same date in 1961. This represents 106.4 percent of the August 1, 1961 figure. The August 1, 1962, total includes 3,549,633,000 bushels of corn for grain as compared with 3,352,037 bushels on the same date in 1961. For grain sorghum the figures indicate a production of 485,170,000 bushels for 1962 as compared with 454,564,000 bushels in 1961. The production of oats and barley are also increased above the 1961 figure.

The Department of Agriculture shows a slight reduction in the production of corn in 1962 as compared to 1961, but I would call attention to the fact that this is quite an unrealistic approach when we compare the August 1, 1962, estimate with the final estimate for 1961. It should be further noted that the August estimate in 1961 went up 13 percent from that date and the final estimate. If the same situation prevails in 1962—and there is every indication it will—then we could come up with a vastly increased corn production over 1961.

Turning now to wheat—which is a basic commodity in many sections of the country, including the great State of Utah—I would point out that even though we have a larger carryover of wheat than is desired and needed to meet

our requirements, roughly 83 percent of this wheat is composed of the Hard Red Winter class. I ask consent to insert a table showing the wheat production carryover by classes, for the period 1957–61 and for the 1962 crop year. The types of wheat grown in Utah are, for the most part, not in oversupply. For example, the carryover for Soft Red Winter wheat was only 1.7 percent.

The Secretary of Agriculture has already announced a wheat referendum for August 30. This referendum is authorized by present permanent legislation, the Agricultural Act of 1938. In my estimation, it would be unwise for the Congress to enact any legislation at this late date that would change the plans of the Secretary of Agriculture for conducting his referendum. Mind you, it is scheduled for a week from Friday. I suggest that we allow this referendum to go forward as planned and that we take no action with regard to wheat for 1963, and that each of us go back to our respective States, and through the farm organizations, the wheatgrowers' associations, and individual wheat producers, try to ascertain the best possible solution to this problem and come back at the beginning of the 88th Congress and take a fresh start and a fresh look at this problem.

I would support a simple amendment to this bill which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to implement a voluntary wheat reduction program for 1963. By so doing, it would not interfere at all with the referendum procedure set up and would give those farmers who desire an opportunity to make reductions.

The so-called multiple-price plan for wheat, as embodied in title III-B of H.R. 12391, delegates tremendous authority to the Secretary of Agriculture. I believe that there are over 20 authorities granted by this title that would make the Secretary of Agriculture a virtual czar over wheat. I ask consent to insert

in the RECORD a listing of these power grants to the Secretary. I recognize the need to place reasonable controls on the expenditure of Federal funds, but I become gravely concerned when I review the extraordinary discretionary powers this bill gives to the Secretary of Agriculture to issue regulations applicable to producers, processors, warehousemen, and exporters.

Recent revelations of scandal within the Department of Agriculture should serve as ample warning against the danger of placing additional bureaucratic powers in the hands of those who would control agriculture.

Last, but by no means least, I am concerned about the impact of this bill on the consumer. This complicated version of the multiple-price wheat plan imposes a bread tax on our domestic consumers. I ask consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Modern Miller and Bakers News expressing concern over the trend of events. By authorizing the inclusion of export wheat in the primary market it would further raise already high export costs. On the other hand, the blended pricing would subsidize the dumping of noncertificated wheat in the domestic feed market to the detriment of producers of feed grains, livestock, dairy, and poultry.

There is such a thing as too much theoretical dabbling with agricultural economic factors. In summary, this legislation hurts everyone: The poultry, dairy and livestock farmers in particular, and the consumers, and taxpayers in general, and that, my fellow colleagues, covers all of us. In my opinion no new legislation is preferable to this emergency bill.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the requests of the Senator from Utah?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wheat production, carryover, total supply, and percentages by class, 1957–61 averages, annual 1961–62

Class	Production				Carryover				Total supply			
	1957–61 average		1962 crop		1957–61 average		July 1, 1962		1957–61 average		Year 1961	
	Million bushels	Percent of total	Million bushels	Percent of total	Million bushels	Percent of total	Million bushels	Percent of total	Million bushels	Percent of total	Million bushels	Percent of total
Hard Red Winter.....	687	50.1	755	61.1	863	74.3	1,120	83.3	1,550	64.7	1,864	70.3
Soft Red Winter.....	179	14.6	203	16.4	12	1.0	23	1.7	191	8.0	215	8.1
Hard Red Spring.....	171	14.0	116	9.4	221	19.0	176	13.1	400	16.7	359	13.5
White.....	161	13.1	142	11.5	49	4.2	25	1.8	210	8.8	180	6.8
Durum.....	27	2.2	19	1.6	17	1.5	1	.1	44	1.8	35	1.3
Total.....	1,225	100.0	1,235	100.0	1,162	100.0	1,345	100.0	2,395	100.0	2,653	100.0

Disposition of wheat by class, 1957–61 average, marketing year 1961–62

Class	1957–61 average						1961–62 average					
	Domestic		Exports		Total disappearance		Domestic		Exports		Total disappearance	
	Million bushels	Percent of total	Million bushels	Percent of total	Million bushels	Percent of total	Million bushels	Percent of total	Million bushels	Percent of total	Million bushels	Percent of total
Hard Red Winter.....	256	42.8	336	61.3	592	51.7	262	44.1	482	67.6	744	56.9
Soft Red Winter.....	132	22.1	45	8.2	177	15.4	135	22.7	57	8.0	192	14.7
Hard Red Spring.....	141	23.6	42	7.7	183	16.0	140	23.5	43	6.0	183	14.0
White.....	45	7.5	120	21.9	165	14.4	40	6.7	115	16.1	155	11.8
Durum.....	24	4.0	5	.9	29	2.5	18	3.0	16	2.3	34	2.6
Total.....	598	100.0	548	100.0	1,146	100.0	595	100.0	713	100.0	1,308	100.0

TITLE III-B OF H.R. 12391 DELEGATES BROAD AUTHORITY TO SECRETARY

Major discretionary authorities are summarized below:

Authority to determine if referendum shall be for 1, 2, or 3 years.

Authority to determine size of national marketing quota (not less than 1 billion bushels) and to determine annual drawdown of stocks.

Authority to determine that allotment for any type of wheat in short supply shall be increased above allotment otherwise computed in amount determined by the Secretary.

Authority to exclude from program any State with less than 25,000 acres of allotment.

Authority to determine what may be planted on diverted acreage, the amount by which the diversion payment will be reduced if such crops are planted, and whether or not diverted acreage may be grazed.

Authority to determine the amount of payment for wheat diverted acreage (not more than 50 percent of the support rate on normal yield).

Authority to determine conservation uses which must be practiced on diverted acreage and to determine a conservation base on each farm which must be exceeded by acreage of wheat diverted and to adjust payment for failure to comply with conservation requirements.

Authority to determine if advance diversion payments shall be made (not to exceed 50 percent of total).

Authority to establish such terms and conditions not specified in law as Secretary deems "desirable to effectuate purposes" of conservation program.

Authority to determine how many the number of wheat-marketing certificates that shall be issued for food and export (export includes wheat disposed of under Public Law 480, including donations and sales for foreign currencies).

Authority to determine the value of wheat-marketing certificates.

Authority to issue regulations relating to transfer of wheat-marketing certificates.

Authority to determine under what circumstances wheat-marketing certificates shall be purchased by CCC from farmers.

Authority to determine if CCC should establish a pool for marketing certificates and to prescribe regulations relating thereto and the fees to be charged for handling marketing certificates.

Authority to establish conversion factors to determine amount of wheat in any food product.

Authority to "take such action as he determines to be necessary to facilitate the transition" to the new program.

Authority to exempt "all or a portion" of food products in process on effective date of new program or to sell owners thereof certificates at such prices as the Secretary may determine.

Authority to require processors, warehousemen, exporters, and others dealing with wheat certificates to "keep such records as the Secretary finds to be necessary."

Authority to require processors, warehousemen, exporters, and others dealing with wheat certificates to submit such reports as the Secretary finds necessary.

Authority to examine the books, papers, records, accounts, correspondence, contracts, documents, and memorandums as the Secretary finds necessary to ascertain the correctness of records and reports.

Authority to deny marketing certificates to any producer "in whole or in part, as the Secretary may determine" for any violation of the law or regulations, without judicial action.

Authority to "prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subtitle."

Authority to establish a level of price support for certificate wheat at any level between 65 and 90 percent of parity.

Authority to establish the level of price support for noncertificate wheat.

CONCLUSION

The Secretary of Agriculture would become the czar of the wheat industry, with extraordinary discretionary powers to issue regulations applicable to producers, processors, warehousemen, and exporters.

MODERN MILLER & BAKERS NEWS, JULY 7, 1962

(By C. M. Yeager)

Inasmuch as the people of the United States have traded so many of their rights for the security offered by socialization, it is no great surprise that they now find themselves victims of incompetent leadership, about which they can, momentarily, do absolutely nothing. Agriculture is in the most glorious state of snafu since the locusts of Biblical fame. The arbitrary dictum which foisted sedimentation on commercial wheat users was as irresponsible as it was idiotic. It has resulted in a state of confusion in which no one can see a satisfactory conclusion.

With the new loan basis which became effective July 1, the price of wheat automatically became enough higher to satisfy the objectives of Secretary Freeman, but it seems that those objectives are insatiable. It was an insult to reason to add a bonus via the sedimentation test, adding exorbitant premiums to an already exorbitant base price. A selling point for sedimentation was that it would establish a better quality evaluation for foreign buyers. We have a Government team abroad now "explaining" sedimentation and this team is getting a big horse laugh. In fact, foreign colossal nonsense. Maybe they still carry the illusion that we can do anything about it. Maybe they don't know that we have sacrificed the right to do anything about it.

Be that as it may, millers and bakers are in a situation where intelligent action in either wheat or flour buying is impossible. At present, opinion is that the less one does, the more likely he will be to minimize costly mistakes. The amount of wheat millers have accumulated is a drop in the bucket compared with their usual holdings at this point in the harvest. Sheer necessity compels them to buy some to fill the immediate needs of their customers, but they dare not amass wheat when bakers are not resigned to pay the price for flour which wheat costs impel. So wheat that millers and grain men would customarily own is going into the Government vaults, where ordinary wheat assumes blue-chip value.

Thus two separate and distinct markets are created. One, the commercial market, is based on protein values and farinograph curves that reflect baking value. This is a limited market, where the buyer is trying to get something for his money even if he has to pay unrealistic premiums. The other is a Government market which takes anything with the taxpayers' money. It's rough competition.

It seems likely that flour buying will undergo a radical change. Bakers are altogether unwilling to commit themselves to long-term purchases wherein they see no possible advantage. There is the possibility, suspected by many, but so far unproved, that sedimentation values decline in storage, whereas protein remains unchanged. If this be so, maybe some of the artificial premiums on wheat will vanish. At this point, one must conjure with rust damage, an unknown quantity in the spring wheat crop, though it looks good now, adverse legislation, possible less world demand for American wheat.

All these make flour buying a wide-open matter of guesswork or speculation in which

individual opinions will express themselves through the coming months. The great mass buying movements of recent years are less likely to occur under such adverse circumstances. At any rate, nothing can forestall much higher flour prices nor stay the inevitable increase in the price of bread.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO INSURE MORTGAGES UNDER SECTIONS 809 AND 810 OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2876) to extend the authority to insure mortgages under sections 809 and 810 of the National Housing Act, and to extend the coverage of section 810 to include persons employed at or in connection with an installation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or the Atomic Energy Commission, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the last proviso in section 803(a) of the National Housing Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "under this title" and inserting in lieu thereof "under this section"; and

(2) by striking out "under section 803 of this title" and inserting in lieu thereof "under this section".

Sec. 2. Section 809(f) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "and the expiration date of the Commissioner's authority to insure", and by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "No more mortgages shall be insured under this section after October 1, 1963, except pursuant to a commitment to insure before such date."

Sec. 3. Section 810(k) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "and the expiration date of the Commissioner's authority to insure", and by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "No more mortgages shall be insured under this section after October 1, 1963, except pursuant to a commitment to insure before such date."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to extend for one year the authority to insure mortgages under sections 809 and 810 of the National Housing Act."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 3662) to authorize improvements for the prevention of beach erosion and hurricane damages along the south shore of Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, N.J., which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

DRUG INDUSTRY ANTITRUST ACT— AMENDMENT

Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. DODD, and Mr. HART) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1552) to amend and supplement the antitrust laws with respect to the manufacture and distribution of drugs, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE, TO PROVIDE INCREASES IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPEN- SATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 10743) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 22, 1962, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, August 21, 1962:

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION
John L. Seigenthaler, of Tennessee, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information for the remainder of the term expiring January 27, 1964, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified, vice Jonathan W. Daniels, resigned.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Givon Parsons, of Texas.
B. Winfred Ruffner, of Tennessee.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Arthur A. Compton, of Michigan.
Richard H. Courtenaye, of California.
Miss Eileen R. Donovan, of Massachusetts.
Terrance G. Leonhardy, of North Dakota.
James H. McFarland, Jr., of Michigan.
Miss Edna H. Barr, of Ohio, for reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, in accordance with the provisions of section 520(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 8 to class 7:
Francesco J. Alberti, Jr., of California.
Charles E. Angevine, of Colorado.
Merle E. Arp, of Iowa.
Thomas F. Barthelemy, of Ohio.
Lyndall G. Beamer, of Illinois.
J. Peter Becker, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Margaret E. Beshore, of Indiana.

Harry R. Bieling, Jr., of New York.
James K. Bishop, Jr., of New York.
William D. Boggs, of West Virginia.
John A. Boyle, of New York.
Alfred P. Brainard, of Washington.
Joseph R. Breton, of Massachusetts.
Gordon S. Brown, of California.
James A. Budelt, of Nebraska.
Moises L. Cantolla, of California.
Robert C. Cary, of Washington.
Louis N. Cavanaugh, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Glenn Richard Cella, of New York.
Timothy W. Childs, of Connecticut.
William P. Clappin, of Virginia.
Hovey C. Clark, of New Jersey.
Carl John Clement, of Minnesota.
Harry L. Coburn, of New York.
John Albert Collins, of New York.
Thomas C. Colwell, of California.
Gordon A. Cornell, of Massachusetts.
Edwin G. Corr, of Oklahoma.
Anthony S. Dalsimer, of New York.
Ernest B. Dane III, of Massachusetts.
John S. Davison, of Michigan.
R. Robin DeLaBarre, of the District of Columbia.
John W. DeWitt, of Pennsylvania.
V. Raymond Dickey, of South Dakota.
David H. Dinwoodie, of Colorado.
Richard J. Dols, of Minnesota.
Felix Dorrough, of Alabama.
William J. Duiker III, of the District of Columbia.
William H. Edgar, of the District of Columbia.
David K. Edminster, of the District of Columbia.
Emil P. Ericksen, of California.
Robert E. Ezelle, of California.
James Ferrer, Jr., of California.
Robert M. Fouché, of South Carolina.
Anthony G. Freeman, of New Jersey.
Miss Marlene W. Futterman, of New York.
Gregory Gay, of Ohio.
Gerald D. Gilbertson, of California.
Phillip C. Gill, of California.
Ernest Thomas Greene, of New Hampshire.
Robert V. D. Griffin, of California.
J. Guy Gwynne, of Arkansas.
Miss Lois Haase, of Missouri.
James T. Hackett, of California.
Samuel J. Hamrick, Jr., of Kentucky.
Donald F. Hart, of Massachusetts.
Pierre M. Hartman, of Colorado.
Martin G. Heflin, of Florida.
Frank G. Helman, of Pennsylvania.
Charles Higginson, of Massachusetts.
Richard Hines, of New York.
Herbert A. Hoffman, of Pennsylvania.
James F. Hughes III, of New York.
Mrs. Sandra A. Humphrey, of New Jersey.
L. Richard Jackson, of Missouri.
William Harding Jackson, Jr., of Virginia.
Jay K. Katzen, of New York.
George Lockwood Kelly, of Georgia.
Harmon E. Kirby, of Ohio.
Anthony S. Kochanek, Jr., of New Jersey.
Thor H. Kuniholm, of the District of Columbia.
Walter J. Landry, of Louisiana.
James O. Langland, of Iowa.
Donald R. Lesh, of Massachusetts.
Paul A. London, of New York.
Howard C. Loper, of Pennsylvania.
Matthew T. Lorimer, of New Hampshire.
George E. Lowe, of Illinois.
Hallock R. Lucius, of Montana.
Robert S. McClellan, of New York.
William J. McDonough, of Illinois.
John J. MacDougall, of Massachusetts.
Donald M. Maclay, of Pennsylvania.
Edward A. Mainland, of California.
Thomas W. Mapp, of California.
William H. Marsh, of Pennsylvania.
Jim B. Marshall, of Tennessee.
Robert A. Martin, of Pennsylvania.
Harlan G. Moen, of Wisconsin.
Gerald Joseph Monroe, of New Mexico.
John B. Moody, of Georgia.
James H. Moss, of the District of Columbia.
Gerald H. Murphy, of New York.
William V. P. Newlin, of Pennsylvania.

Thomas J. O'Donnell, of Michigan.
Donathon C. Olliff, of Alabama.
Robert O'Neill, of Virginia.
Robert H. Pelletreau, Jr., of New York.
John D. Perkins, of Indiana.
Donald K. Petterson, of California.
Miss Anne Pinkney, of California.
Lutz Alexander Prager, of Maryland.
Henry Precht, of Virginia.
Robert L. Pugh, of Washington.
Miss Virginia Randolph, of Pennsylvania.
Alexander L. Rattray, of California.
Leo J. Reddy, of Maryland.
Robert G. Richmond, of New Hampshire.
Thomas J. Roesch, of Ohio.
Irving L. Sanders, of Washington.
Richard C. Schenck, of New York.
Carl W. Schmidt, of New Jersey.
Louis Schwartz, Jr., of Illinois.
Richard C. Scissors, of Missouri.
Norman T. Shaft, of Minnesota.
John C. Shea, of Pennsylvania.
Harrison B. Sherwood, of Minnesota.
William T. Shinn, Jr., of Minnesota.
John P. Sifling, of Ohio.
Henry Jacob Silverman, of New Jersey.
Richard J. Smith, of Connecticut.
Robert R. Strand, of Ohio.
William O. Sugg III, of Tennessee.
Peter A. Sutherland, of Massachusetts.
Garett Gordon Sweany, of Washington.
Rush W. Taylor, Jr., of Texas.
Elroy Thiel, of Wisconsin.
Charles H. Thomas II, of New Hampshire.
Samuel B. Thomsen, of California.
Ralph G. Thorslund, of Florida.
Thomas M. Tracy, of Massachusetts.
Mrs. Joan L. Ward, of Ohio.
John William Warnock, Jr., of Ohio.
Keith W. Wheelock, of Maryland.
Theodore S. Wilkinson III, of the District of Columbia.
H. L. Dufour Woolfley, of Louisiana.
Warren Zimmermann, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Jack R. Binns, of Washington.
John S. Brims, of New Jersey.
Richard P. Draves, of New York.
Irving Lewis Fuller, Jr., of Virginia.
Marshall J. Jeannero, of Massachusetts.
Allan M. Parrent, of Kentucky.
David E. Zweifel, of Colorado.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Adrian Anthony Basora, of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.
Richard W. Bogosian, of Massachusetts.
John Franklin Campbell, of California.
Daniel H. Clare III, of the District of Columbia.
Clarke N. Ellis, of California.
Donald C. Ellison, of Indiana.
William A. Garland, of Maryland.
Donald Furse Herr, of Ohio.
Richard Holbrooke, of New York.
Robert Onan Homme, of Minnesota.
Robert G. Houdek, of Illinois.
William A. K. Lake, of Connecticut.
Vladimir Lehovitch, of New York.
William Harold Levit, Jr., of California.
David E. Long, of Florida.
Joseph Charles Luman, of Pennsylvania.
George R. Martens, of New York.
James Richard Matz, of Texas.
George E. Mercer, of Michigan.
Bradford William Miller, Jr., of New York.
Ronald Peter Myers, of Michigan.
Samuel R. Peale, of New York.
Miss Sarah I. Rowley, of Michigan.
John Todd Stewart, of California.
Michael Acton Taylor, of Indiana.
James W. Wheatley, of Tennessee.
James C. Whitlock, Jr., of North Carolina.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Clarence E. Barbier, of Connecticut.
Thomas G. Charouhas, of California.
Ernest J. Colton, of Virginia.
David I. Hitchcock, Jr., of Connecticut.
William E. MacFarlane, of Virginia.
William B. Maillefert, of Connecticut.
Charles L. Medd, of New York.
Ralph H. Redford, of Utah.
Robert Reynolds, of California.
George Sekel, Jr., of Ohio.
David W. Smith, of Utah.
Marvin E. Taylor, of South Carolina.
Lewis C. Wendell, Jr., of New York.
James R. Ward, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

William T. Fowlkes, Jr., of Virginia, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a vice consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Richard J. Allenbach, of California.
Donald E. Boyd, of Missouri.
Gerd Michael Elsenstadt, of New York.
George W. Ford II, of Maryland.
Robert E. Goodenough, of Indiana.
Robert F. Grealy, of Massachusetts.
Bill J. Houston, of Iowa.
Woodson K. Johnson, of Virginia.
Francis J. McArdle, of Georgia.
James J. Martin, of Virginia.
Michael T. F. Pistor, of New York.
Wayne W. Taylor, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Henry F. Arnold, of New Jersey.
George L. Coale, Jr., of California.
J. Foster Collins, of Virginia.
Robert N. Crowell, of Nevada.
Alexander B. Daspit, of Louisiana.
John P. Dimmer, Jr., of Maine.
Edward C. Fenimore, of Maryland.
Edward J. Foy, Jr., of Texas.
Conrad E. LaGueux, of Rhode Island.
Mortimer C. Love, of Pennsylvania.
Robert E. McCoy, of Oregon.
John M. Mecklin, of New Hampshire.
Eric Neff, of the District of Columbia.
N. Paul Neilson, of Pennsylvania.
John P. Nevins, of Vermont.
William F. Roy, of Idaho.
Walter S. Snowden, of New Jersey.
Nicholas G. W. Thorne, of Connecticut.
Charles S. Whitehurst, of Florida.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Jean A. Graffis, of Virginia.
W. John Wilson, of California.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

John W. Green, Jr., Banks, Ala., in place of D. G. Dorrell, retired.
Edwin E. Crowder, Warrior, Ala., in place of E. D. Jolly, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Maxine O. McCreary, Alderpoint, Calif., in place of M. M. Tibbitts, retired.
Yvonne R. Fletcher, Dunnigan, Calif., in place of D. N. Davis, deceased.
Ward A. Peart, Grimes, Calif., in place of Irene Beckley, retired.
Richard R. Mason, La Canada, Calif., in place of H. E. Cooper, retired.
Robert B. Wolley, Palmdale, Calif., in place of Genevieve Frahm, retired.

COLORADO

Fredda H. Mizner, Pine, Colo. Office established July 22, 1961.

FLORIDA

Ralph M. Miller, Gulf Breeze, Fla., in place of M. X. Benson, transferred.
Helen M. Holt, Longboat Key, Fla., in place of D. L. Williams, deceased.

IDAH0

Ella E. Johnson, Bovill, Idaho, in place of E. R. David, retired.

ILLINOIS

Lee Bush, Cambria, Ill., in place of Edmond Lovel, retired.
Leonard D. Wingo, Kenney, Ill., in place of Enid Trowbridge, retired.

INDIANA

Orian A. Karns, Coal City, Ind., in place of W. L. Wells, transferred.
Grover G. Phillips, Elmore, Ind., in place of E. D. Malone, retired.
Joseph A. Jones, Hillsdale, Ind., in place of L. J. Britton, deceased.
Dale R. Richardson, Monon, Ind., in place of W. S. Buss, retired.
Winfred H. Hartman, Monterey, Ind., in place of C. A. Good, retired.
Gerald J. Minderman, Vincennes, Ind., in place of J. B. Cogan, deceased.

IOWA

Florence K. Hamilton, Riverside, Iowa, in place of J. R. Shebek, retired.

KANSAS

Virgil S. McIntyre, Coldwater, Kans., in place of J. D. Vance, transferred.
C. Allen Houk, Moran, Kans., in place of F. M. McAdam, retired.

KENTUCKY

Freda L. Gooch, Kings Mountain, Ky., in place of W. B. Reynolds, deceased.
Pauline P. Terry, Upton, Ky., in place of H. B. Burks, retired.

LOUISIANA

Garnet M. Simoneaux, Allemands, La., in place of E. O. Broussard, retired.

MAINE

Erroll E. Grant, Abbot Village, Maine, in place of J. P. Morse, deceased.
George A. Haines, Easton, Maine, in place of M. A. Cahill, retired.

MARYLAND

Richard H. Bates, Branchville, Md., in place of F. K. Hazard, retired.
Virginia M. Goode, Marbury, Md., in place of L. S. Henderson, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Samuel A. Vinniti, Seekonk, Mass., in place of G. M. Olin, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Joseph M. Dean, Bad Axe, Mich., in place of H. L. Muchler, retired.
Alvin R. Wiler, Bronson, Mich., in place of C. C. Hollister, retired.
Mary E. Kurrie, Corunna, Mich., in place of Wynne Vanderkarr, removed.
Gerald E. Nopola, Covington, Mich., in place of Alma Hill, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Hugh D. Campbell, Bigfork, Minn., in place of F. E. Evensen, retired.
William R. Trebnick, Bovey, Minn., in place of E. F. Lerohl, retired.
Richard W. Foley, Bruno, Minn., in place of E. L. Downing, deceased.
Francis M. Wall, Cosmos, Minn., in place of D. W. Anderson, transferred.
Emil W. Lehman, Dodge Center, Minn., in place of J. H. Diercks, deceased.
Hardin H. Kinder, Lynd, Minn., in place of A. H. Roloff, retired.
Lyman C. Irrgang, Nicollet, Minn., in place of W. H. Gronholz, Jr., transferred.

Burnett H. Voss, Northfield, Minn., in place of C. C. Heibel, retired.
Elayne J. O'Brien, Pemberton, Minn., in place of G. R. Goodrich, transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

Beryl P. Kaigler, Fernwood, Miss., in place of T. L. Simpson, retired.

MISSOURI

Howard A. Cates, Noel, Mo., in place of K. H. Perry, removed.
Calvin F. Schmille, Westboro, Mo., in place of B. E. Tucker, retired.

MONTANA

Dale Bond, Brockway, Mont., in place of A. L. Bond, retired.

NEBRASKA

James C. Bryant, Ashland, Nebr., in place of B. E. Kammerer, retired.
Emanuel Roth, Gering, Nebr., in place of F. H. Walters, retired.
Elsie A. Baxa, Western, Nebr., in place of C. S. Haddix, transferred.

NEW MEXICO

Laudente T. Quintana, Wagon Mound, N. Mex., in place of H. M. Vigil, transferred.

NEW YORK

Michael Pokitko, Burt, N.Y., in place of C. W. Rentschler, retired.
Robert L. Steere, Falconer, N.Y., in place of S. G. Peterson, deceased.
Edward C. Lavery, Geneseo, N.Y., in place of C. G. Dwyer, retired.
Betty M. Tyrrell, Severance, N.Y., in place of H. V. Tyrrell, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Anne U. Gordon, Browns Summit, N.C., in place of M. G. Bishop, retired.
Herbert B. Edgerton, Goldsboro, N.C., in place of L. P. Gardner, deceased.
John H. Sampson, Pembroke, N.C., in place of J. R. Lowry, retired.
Ray V. Garris, Jr., Roaring River, N.C., in place of Bessie Caudill, retired.
William A. Lattimore, Shelby, N.C., in place of R. M. Laughridge, deceased.
Niels Jorgensen, Southport, N.C., in place of J. B. Russ, removed.
Bruce N. Conyers, Wilson, N.C., in place of G. T. Fulghum, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Harold I. Iverson, Sawyer, N. Dak., in place of M. M. Sillman, retired.

OHIO

William L. Friece, New Holland, Ohio, in place of C. W. Briggs, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Freddie C. Mittelstet, Aline, Okla., in place of G. E. Gilmore, retired.
Evelyn D. Hutchison, Choctaw, Okla., in place of G. M. Cunningham, retired.
Ethel F. Smyth, Okemah, Okla., in place of J. W. Smyth, deceased.
E. Taylor Lain, Ponca City, Okla., in place of J. G. Maddox, retired.
William J. Foley, Pondcreek, Okla., in place of E. M. Light, deceased.

OREGON

Lawrence J. Armbrust, Creswell, Ore., in place of W. W. Lower, retired.
Ray E. Shaw, Junction City, Ore., in place of I. R. Howard, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Charles H. Heffner, Arendtsville, Pa., in place of W. A. Raffensperger, retired.
Charles H. Gough, Ashland, Pa., in place of H. J. Betz, deceased.
Harry D. Hess, Bangor, Pa., in place of A. R. Cramer, retired.
Jack A. Lanager, Clearfield, Pa., in place of A. R. Hinkle, retired.
Derry A. Miller, Clearville, Pa., in place of Marshall Troutman, retired.

E. Eugene Gemill, Dallastown, Pa., in place of C. V. B. Daugherty, resigned.
 Ruth M. Rosencrance, Greeley, Pa., in place of E. L. Rosencrance, resigned.
 Margaret J. Knight, Industry, Pa., in place of A. W. Ewing, retired.
 Merle C. Bamat, Lanse, Pa., in place of Adolph Johnson, retired.
 Horace F. Vasellas, Red Lion, Pa., in place of C. F. McGuigan, resigned.
 Agnes K. Timko, Windber, Pa., in place of C. W. Baumgardner, deceased.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Clarence O. Opsahl, Pierpont, S. Dak., in place of O. R. Otis, retired.

TENNESSEE

Robert F. Sexton, Dover, Tenn., in place of G. W. Sexton, resigned.
 Edward A. Marrs, Loudon, Tenn., in place of J. W. Simpson, retired.

TEXAS

Harbert S. Byers, Celeste, Tex., in place of S. M. Compton, retired.
 Ernest L. Davis, Dimmitt, Tex., in place of T. F. Bice, retired.
 J. Hayes Johnson, Jr., Mount Pleasant, Tex., in place of A. B. Gilpin, deceased.
 Spencer C. Beavers, Jr., Muleshoe, Tex., in place of A. J. Gardner, transferred.
 Floyd R. Fuqua, Paradise, Tex., in place of J. J. Barnett, retired.
 Norma G. Skinner, Port Aransas, Tex., in place of E. C. Dallas, deceased.
 George W. Finch, San Benito, Tex., in place of A. M. Bowie, retired.
 Venita F. Jobe, Saragosa, Tex., in place of Wynn Hamilton, retired.
 Marvin G. Handrick, Thorndale, Tex., in place of F. H. Pearce, Sr., deceased.

VERMONT

Catherine M. Dailey, Hartford, Vt., in place of M. A. Dailey, retired.

VIRGINIA

Alma L. Nethers, Amissville, Va., in place of E. C. Cooksey, retired.
 Glenn T. Litton, Dante, Va., in place of R. S. Griffith, Jr., resigned.
 Larry S. Powell, Stanardsville, Va., in place of E. L. Southard, retired.

WASHINGTON

Kenneth D. Crofoot, Riverside, Wash., in place of A. J. Dickinson, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Margaret F. Hawks, Page, W. Va., in place of V. T. Bailey, resigned.

WYOMING

Orville E. Haney, Frannie, Wyo., in place of Warren Clark, deceased.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 22, 1962

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rabbi Morris Pickholz, Congregation B'nai Jeshurun Ahavas Chesed, Philadelphia, Pa., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, Thou who created this world out of chaos, established law and order in the heavenly bodies, and granted man the ability to continue Thy work by creating law and order in human affairs.

Our Founding Fathers who fashioned this august body did so in the noblest tradition of creation. Theirs was the

vision that enabled this body to keep our country true to the principles of justice and morality.

Endow, therefore, we pray Thee, Thy servants who minister here, with wisdom and understanding, so that our great land may continue to enjoy the fruits of their labors.

Living in an era fraught with danger and possessing the destructive force to return this world to chaos, we realize, more than ever, how dependent we are upon Thee.

Inspire in those who serve here courage and dedication, so that their counsel and deeds will bring only peace and happiness to us. May our country always remain a beacon of strength and hope to all the nations of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 21, 1962, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 21, 1962,

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported additional amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary to the bill (S. 1552) to amend and supplement the antitrust laws with respect to the manufacture and distribution of drugs, and for other purposes, and submitted a report thereon (pt. 2 of Rept. No. 1744), which was printed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on August 20, 1962, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1174. An act for the relief of Dr. Kwan Ho Lee;

S. 2135. An act to authorize the Securities and Exchange Commission to delegate certain functions;

S. 2455. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Lovic; and

S. 2675. An act for the relief of Yiannoula Vasiliou Tsambiras.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Tom Killefer, of Virginia, to be Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, statements during

the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of the Committee on Government Operations, be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBJECTION BY SENATOR MORSE TO MEETING OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION—OBJECTION TO CERTAIN BILLS FAVORED BY STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have not yet heard any request that the Foreign Relations Committee has permission to meet while the Senate is in session; but I wish to register an objection, in case such a request is made.

I have just come from the Foreign Relations Committee, where I have listened to representatives of the State Department again try to rationalize a series of bills involving dipping into the funds of the taxpayers of the Nation to the extent of a good many thousands of dollars, in the dying days of this session of Congress. I wish to make very clear to my colleagues on that committee that I shall oppose those bills unless the State Department files with the committee adequate memorandums in justification of the bills—something the State Department has not done thus far. Yesterday afternoon, I so notified the Secretary of State.

I do not propose to be guilty of voting in the closing days of this session to be in favor of the continued waste of thousands of dollars abroad just because the State Department seems to think the Treasury of the United States is a bottomless pit.

I warn the Senate that the time has come to put the brakes on the State Department in connection with its proposals to slip these bills through the Congress, in the closing days of this session, without adequate debate on them in the committee.

Furthermore, I object to having the Foreign Relations Committee bring to the floor of the Senate any bill which has not been debated in executive session in that committee; and I object to having the Foreign Relations Committee send to the floor of the Senate any bill under a polling system, when members of the committee know that I have strenuous objections—and I am not alone in that respect in the committee—to these State Department bills. We request our minority rights, at least, if any are left in the Senate, to debate and discuss these bills in executive session in the Foreign Relations Committee, and not have them handled by a polling process, which denies protection of minority rights here in the Senate.